

Jos A *R. F. 152*
DISCOVERY

Acton. d. 8. 152.
Of

The Groundlessness

And

Insincerity

Of my L^d. of Down's DISSUASIVE.

Being

The Fourth *Appendix* to

SURE-FOOTING.

With

A Letter to Dr. Casanbon, and
Another to his Answerer.

By J. S.



*Habentes Speciem quidem Pietatis, Virtutem
autem ejus abnegantes. Et hos devota, 2 Tim. 3. 5.*

L O N D O N,
Printed in the Year MDCLXV.

Corrections of the Press.

pAg. 258. l. 11. my Lds. p. 265. l. 25. have added. p. 267. l. 24.
Exhrem. p. 270. l. 26. sense. p. 279. l. 11. Truths. p. 281. l. 24.
the head. p. 293. l. 21. thing. p. 307. l. 2. thus, *Is*. p. 301. l. 1.
unprov'd. p. 319. l. 1. Characters, p. 320. l. 21. from the words.
p. 327. l. 4. *Schism*.

FOURTH APPENDIX.

Subverting

Fundamentally and manifoldly my Ld. of
Downs *DISSUASIVE.*

1. I Had observ'd my self and was inform'd by others what harm my L. of *Down's DISSUASIVE* did to divers persons; yet I found also that it wrought different Effects in his Protestant Readers according to their respective abilities of understanding. Those who were thoroughly *Intelligent* universally dislik't it as a very weak and ungrounded Discourse; but the *middle* or rather *meaner* sort of Schollers who have sufficient capacity to apprehend the *Sence* of an Objection, yet not enough to weigh by Principles and so comprehend the *force* of it, nor to distinguish between Church and Schools, much less the Sagacity to dive into the many Sophistries, Artifices, and Indirect dealings which mis-us'd Rhetorick can employ to delude men's eye-sight, were many of them startled, and entertain'd a high conceit of it. To which helpt, that their well-meaning and natural sincerity permitted them not to suspect, and so be aware of any deceit in a discourse manag'd all along with so much *formal Gravity* and shoves of the greatest *Piety* that could be: For a *grave carriage* being.

ing, where Nature is not perverted wilfully, the *proper Effect* of a sincere Earnestness and perfect *Seriousness* in the heart, and, *Piety* being conceiv'd to be that which ought to heighten supernaturally that interiour disposition, they are consequently apt to breed in the observer of them a conceit of the greatest *Seriousness* in the world ; Nay even, to those who are very weak and mean well, it gains the Affecter of this way so much Authority that it persuades those who esteem them for it they have perfect Assuredness of what they so soberly write or affirm. Whence follows that this kind of grave and seemingly pious demeanour, especially if carry'd on with a Constancy, is the most Effectual Engin in the world to inveigle rational souls which are not aware of the craft or by looking into Principles *above* it, whether the Discourser pleases : And I conceive our Country hath already so much felt its lamentable Effects out of Pulpits in the beginning of the late troubles, that all reflecters on it are sufficiently warn'd not to think all to be the solid gold of Truth which glitters with Saintly shows. Now, in this consists the most efficacious part of my *L. of Downs Dissuasive* ; the rest, whether Reasons or Citations being very ordinary : And, 'twas this exceeding Plausibleness, and, by means of this, Harmfulness of that Treatise, which oblig'd me to alter my Resolution, and make the Answer to it a fourth Appendix to *Sure-footing*, which I had refus'd to the suggestion of my first Thoughts,

Thoughts, hoping some other would lay it open more at large. But how shall I go about to answer it : For, as *Sampson's* strength lay in his hair, the weakest part that can be found in a man, so the chief Virtue of the *Dissuasive* lies in the Godliness of its style ; which being meer voluntary words and most unapt to make up Propositions expressive of connected Sence or to compile a rational Discourse, 'tis by consequence the weakest peece of performance which can possibly spring from a reasonable Creature ; Yet with this weapon I am soonest beat ; nothing being more averse to my Genius than to *Saint* it in Scripture-phrases (a performance in which, I confess, a *Quaker* would easily worst me, and would even put the Dissuader himself very hard to it) especially in a *Controversy*, which ought to be a severe proof of the Truth of the point under debate. The way then which suits my humour best, and, as I hope, is most efficacious to conclude and satisfy, is to examin by Principles whether there be force of Truth at the bottome, grounding the Dissuader's long Invective. If there be, it ought to have all handsome advantages of Expressions allow'd it ; If not, 'tis no more, as to the Harmony of Truth, but the running a great deal of division upon no Ground.

2. I shall suppose the Reader of this Appendix hath already perus'd & weigh'd the force of my Reasonings in SURE FOOTING ; which done, he will easily comprehend the strength of this Reply,

ply, and the manifold weakness of my *L. of Downs* **DISSUASIVE.** All Truths being *connected*, it follows that every Errour is by consequence opposit to all Truths, and They to it. Hence each single Errour lies open to be confuted *many wayes*, if the method of Reason or *Connexion* be taken. I take therefore that method; because, by its priviledge of bringing things to First-Principles, 'tis apt to undermine and blow up Errour from its very Foundations. Eight several mines I lay to perform this Effect; each of which Wayes is alone sufficient to do my work.

First Way.

3. **T**He First is to alledge that my *L. of Downs* has not one First or Self-evident Principle to begin with, on which he builds his *Dissuasive* from Catholick Faith. If I wrong him, let him do himself right by pointing it out and showing that 'tis opposit to our Churches Doctrine; which if he does, I here yield my self absolutely confuted. In the mean time I have prov'd that Tradition's Certainty is the *First Principle of CONTROVERSY*, and am confident in the Invincible force of Truth that all the Wit in the World cannot confute that position. And if it stands, he is convinc't not onely to *want* the *First Principle* of the Science we are to discourse in, but (his Cause forcing him to re-
nounce

nounce Tradition's Certainty) to go point-blank *against* it, and so to invalidate to our hands all he shall write as a Controvertist; and how weakly he behaves himself where he goes about to lay other Principles, shall be shown when I come to answer his *First Section*. Now, seeing all Reason has force by relying on the Truth of the Premises, and they are known to be true either by being *First Principles* themselves, or by being finally resolvable into others which are such, it follows there can be no *true Reason* where there is no *First Principle*. Till he shows us then that he builds his Dissuasive on some First Principles, it will follow his whole Endeavour is to dissuade not by way of *Reason* but *Fine Words*, which are indeed the Substantiallest, strongest and most efficacious part of his whole Book.

Second Way.

4. **T**HE Second Way is to exclude him all right to alledge either Scriptures, Fathers or Councils; I add, Reason, History or Instances, (See *Corol.* 12. 15, 16, 18, 19.) And, 'tis done thus. All discourse supposes that *Certain* on which it builds: But, if *Tradition* or the way of conveying down matters of Fact by the former Ages testifying can fail, none of these are *Certain*: therefore a Protestant or Renouncer of Tradition cannot with Reason pretend to discourse out of any of these: that is, (Reason being Man's Nature)

ture) he has lost his natural right to alledge any of these in way of proof. Now, that none of these are *Certain* if Tradition be renounc't is shown thus. Scripture's Letter as to its Incorruptedness, nay its very Being, is *Uncertain* alone, or without Tradition, as is confest by Protestants, and prov'd *Sure-Footing* Disc. 3^d, and 4th. So are Fathers and Councils too; For, *Fathers* being Eminent Witnessers to Immediate Posterity or Children of the *Churches* Doctrin received, and Councils Representatives of the Church, their strength as Proofs, nay their very Existence is not known till the notion of Church be known, which is part of their very Definition and to which they relate. Nor is the Being or Nature of Church known, till it be Certainly known who are truly *Faithful* or have *true Faith*, who not; which must be manifested by their having or not having the true *Rule of Faith*: Wherefore, since the Properties of the Rule of Faith do all agree to Tradition our Rule, and none of them to theirs, as was evidently and at large shown there in my five first Discourses: it follows, the Protestant or Renouncer of Tradition knows not what is either right Scripture, Father or Council; and so ought not to meddle with them, nor alledge them. Again, since pretended Instances of Tradition's Failing depend on History, & Historical Certainty cannot be built on dead Characters but on *Living Sence* in men's hearts deliver'd from age to age that those passages are true; that is, on

Tradi-

Tradition; it follows, that, if the way of *Tradition* can fail, all *History* is *Uncertain*; and consequently, all *Instances* as being matters of *Fact* depending on *History*. And, lastly, since *Reasons* are fetch't from the *nature* of things, and the *best Nature* in what it is, abstracting from disease or madness, *Unalterable*, is the *Ground* of the *human part* of *Christian Tradition*, and most incomparable strength is superadded to it as it is *Christian* by the supernatural *Assistances* of the *Holy Ghost* (*Disc. 9.*) 'tis a wild conceit to think any piece of *Nature* or *Discourse* built on it can be held *Certain*, if *Tradition* (especially *Christian Tradition*) may be held *Uncertain*.

Third Way.

5. **T**He Third Way is to examin the *Method* he takes in *dissuading*. For, common sence telling us 'tis not to be expected any should be able to perform any thing unless he takes the *right way* to perform it, 'tis Evident he cannot be held in reason to have *power* to *dissuade*, unless the *Method* he takes be *proper* to that Effect, that is, not *common* to that Effect and a *contrary* one. Now, to *dissuade* is to *unfix* the *Understanding* from what is held before; which includes to make it *hold* or *assent* that what it held before *Certain* is *False* or at least *Uncertain*. The Way then he takes must be evidently able to oblige to some kind of *Assent*, nay, as he handles it (for, I suppose he aims to make them *hold* as

Prote-

Protestants) to Assent to the *contrary*; which therefore must needs require the Evidentest Method imaginable, obliging their Reason to conclude that a man who takes this way of Discourse cannot but make good what he sayes; at least, that it may be strongly hop't from his method he will do it. This reflected on, let us weigh the *Method* my Ld. takes in his *Dissuasive*; and, if it be Evident to every ordinary capacity, that, as to the *Godly* part of it, the *Quakers* out-do him; and, as to its quoting part the *Smeđymnians* us'd the same against the Protestants to confute Episcopacy (for They too quoted and gloss'd Scriptures and Fathers both) and indeed every Sect that has not yet shaken of the shame to disrespect all Antiquity; then 'tis also Evident that this Method is *Common* to those Discourses which have in them *power* to satisfy the Understanding, and those who have *no such power*. Now, that being most evidently *no* Method or Way to such an Effect, which many follow and take, yet arrive *not* at that Effect, 'tis plain to Common Sence that my Ld. of *Downs* miscalls his Book a *Dissuasive* and that it can have in it *no power* of moving the Understanding one way or other, unless he can first vouch some Particularity in the Method *he* takes above whats in *others*, in which we experience miscarriage, and himself professes we, though taking it, miscarry in it. Let us then search after this Particularity in his way of writing. Is it that he brings some stronger

stronger or more unavoidable sort of Testimonies then were ever yet produc't by others? No: Every Scholler sees they are so common that they have been hundreds of times produc't, and himself (p. 1. & 2.) acknowledges their vulgarness. But perhaps he invalidates all the Answers our Controvertists have given to those Testimonies and presses them *farther* against us, beyond what any has done yet! Quite contrary. He barely and rawly puts them down as if this were the very first time they had seen light, nor takes the least notice of any Answer at all given to them formerly. But it may be he layes Grounds to distinguish and press home his Testimonies, and so gives them their full weight which others have not done. Alas, no; I fear he never thinks of that, but judges (if we may conclude from his carriage) the deed done, so he but *quote*; nor can I see *one* Principle laid in his *whole* Book strengthening any one Testimony by bringing it to its Ground, *Experimental Knowledge* in the Authour he cites, that the Churches constant Voice and Practice manifested this her Sence; but as they are put down carelessly, so they are past over slubberingly, without the least enforcing them by way of laying Principles: Is he at least Particular in his Sincerity and Ingenuity? I know not how they will be satisfied with it who read his late Adversary Impeaching him for the contrary Vices, and some passages in this present Appendix. Where lies then this *Particularity*

cularity in his Method, without which his Dissuasive can never in reason be held Creditable? I speak ingenuously and from my heart; All the Particularity I can observe in it lies in these two things; First, that he huddles together multitudes of his own sayings, without any pretence of proof for the most part, and when he brings any they are such as we have spoken of. Next, that instead of enforcing his Proofs by way of Reason, he overflows strangely with godly language and Scripture-phrases; with which plausible manner of Expression most unreasonably and unnaturally he strives to combat the Wills of his Readers, before he hath brought any thing able to satisfy their Understandings.

6. Yet, though his Method have *no* particularity in it as to its *quoting* part, who knows but it may be *very particular* as to its Rational part, that is, full of Proofs which conclude evidently or *Demonstrations*! But I am so far from *feeling* the *force* of any *one* such Proof in his whole Book that I cannot *discern* its very *Existence*, or even any *Attempt* of that kind; and I dare affirm my L^d. of *Downs* never meant it or dream't of it. If he have any such I request his L^p. would in his Reply single them out from all the Pious and Inconclusive Talk which swell his Book, and I promise them very heartily to lend them a due and respectful Consideration. But I am sure he will neither pretend he has any, nor attempt the having any if he but reflect that a *Demonstration*

is a Proof which has in it a virtue of *obliging* the Understanding to *Assent*, and that it obtains this virtue by building on *Intrinsic Mediums*; that is, on *Proper Causes* or *Effects*, of which 'tis impossible the one should be without the other. This *clearing Method* onely the Champions of Truth *dare take*, and the Defenders of Error *must avoid* under penalty of having their Cause quite ruin'd and crush't to pieces. And this severe Method of finding Truth, relying on the Goodness of my Cause, I fear not to take and stick to in *Sure-Footing* as appears there by my *Transition*: which sufficiently shows the Particularity of *my Method*; I expect now my L^d. of *Downs* would show me the particularity of *his*, or renounce all right and Title to *Dissuade*.

7. I have been something longer about laying open the Necessity of a *Proper Method to dissuade* ere one can in reason hope to perform that *Effect*, because I see plainly that, in the pursuit of Truth, *Method* is in a manner *ALL*; and, that 'tis impossible any Controversy should hover long in debate if a right *Method* of concluding evidently were carefully taken and faithfully held to. I have told my L^d. of *Downs* where he may see mine; and I desire him earnestly as he loves Truth either to admit it as *Conclusive* and follow it, or show it *Inconclusive* and propose us a better to begin and proceed with Evidently: And, that I may more efficaciously endeavour to bring him, nay provoke him as far as I may

S

with

with Civility, to a Method particular and proper to dissuade, I declare here before all the world that I know his Cause to be so unable to bear it, and hope himself is so prudent, that he will never either venture to allow our Method competent to conclude evidently, nor yet go about to establish a better of his own.

Fourth Way.

8. **T**He fourth Way of disanulling my L^{ps} whole Endeavours, is to speak *ad hominem* and challenge him thus. Your Grounds allow neither Fathers to be *Infallible* in any Testimony you produce from them to *dissuade* with, nor yet your self in interpreting Scripture; nor (I conceive) will you say that you see with *Infallible* Certainty any Proposition you go about to deduce by Reason (if there be any such in your Dissuasive) to be necessarily consequent from any First or Self-evident Principle, therefore You are *Certain* of nothing you alledge in your whole Book. If then His Lordship would please to speak out candidly, he ought to say; *I know not Certainly that any thing I say against your Religion is true, yet notwithstanding I would fain dissuade you from holding the Faith of your Forefathers, and to relinquish a Religion you judge unalterable and hope to be sav'd by holding it.* Which were it profess'd and deliver'd ingenuously as it lies at the very bottome of his heart,

his

his LP's *Disuasive* would be a pleasant piece, and lose all power to move any Child of common Sence, nay the vulgar Reason of the wild *Irish* would be too hard for it. Now, that this ought in due candour to be profess'd, in case neither the Fathers nor Himself be Infallible in any saying or Proof of theirs, is thus Evident. For, since to be *Infallible in None*, *hic & nunc*, (taking in the whole Complexion of assisting Circumstances) is the same as to be *hic & nunc Fallible in All*, or *Each*, and if they be *Fallible* or *may be deceived* in *Each*, they can be *Sure* of *None*; it follows that who professes the Fathers & Himself (though using all the means he can to secure him from Errour) *Fallible in Each*, must, if he will speak out like an honest man, confess he is *Sure of None*. Let then my L^d. of *Downs* either vouch Infalible Certainty in himself reasoning or Interpreting, or in the Authorities he cites, (I mean Infalible considering their endeavours in complexion with all the means on foot in the world to preserve them so) or else confess that, notwithstanding all means us'd by them they are in each Saying and Proof *Fallible*, and so himself *sare* of never a Motive he brings to *disuade* with. Now, to see so Eminent a Writer and chosen out on purpose (as he professes) by the whole Church of *Ireland*, go about to combat a settled Persuasion, held sacred, unalterable, descending from Christ by Attestation of Forefathers the Way to Bliss, &c. and bring no better Argu-

ments to do it but such as are (were he put to declare it and would speak out) *confessedly Uncertain*, is so far from being a competent *Disuasive* from Catholick Faith, that 'tis when laid open (which is here perform'd) as good a *Persuasive* for the Generality of Catholicks to hold stedfastly to it as man's Wit can invent; and far better to the weaker sort of Speculators than to demonstrate the Infallibility of the Ground of Faith. Such advantage Catholick Faith gains by the Opposition from her Adversaries, if they be rightly handled, and their Discourses brought to Grounds.

Fifth Way.

9. **T**He Fifth Way is built on the fourth, or, indeed on the Protestants voluntary Concession. For they granting they have no Demonstration for the Ground of their Faith, must say they have onely Probability, and consequently that Faith *quoad nos* is *Uncertain*; or (to use their own Expression) that Faith in us is an Assent *cui non subest dubium*, of which we have *no doubt*, yet *cui potest subesse falsum*, or *possible to be false*, which amounts to this that Faith *at large* is but highly probable, much lesse *their* Faith as contradistinguished from *ours*. *Probabilities* then being of such a Nature that they do not absolutely weigh down the scale of our Judgment) I mean while they are seen to be but Probabilities as is

my

my L^d's case) it follows that if there be *Probabilities* for the other side, the way to *dissuade* from It is to put all those probable reasons in the opposit ballance, and then, by comparing them, show they have *no* considerable weight, counterpos'd to those he brings for *his* Tenet. Now, that there is *no* Probability for *our* side is very hard to be said, since the whole world sees plainly we still maintain the Field against them, nay dare pretend without fearing an absolute baffle (which must needs follow had we not at least Probabilities to befriend us) that our Grounds are Evidently and Demonstrably Certain; nay more, dare venture to take the most clearing Method imaginable to stand or fall by, and withal are bold to challenge them that they have *no* Evident Grounds to begin with, nor dare venture to pursue that evidencing Method. But my L^{ds} own words in his *Liberty of Prophecyng*, Sect. 20. §. 2. will beyond all confute evince it, *ad hominem* at least, that we have Probabilities, and those strong ones too on our side. I pick out some, leaving out other weighty ones which his Expressions had too much deform'd. His words are these. *Such as are the Beauty and Splendor of their Church; their pompous Service; the Stateliness and Solemnity of the Hierarchy; their name of CATHOLICK, which they suppose their own due and to concern no other sort of Christians* (he ought have said, *which the establisht use of the word and de-*

riv'd down to the Successours of those who first had
 that Name, forces all, even their Adversaries, to
 give them when they speak naturally; and makes
 them despair of obtaining it for themselves) The
 Antiquity of many of their Doctrins; The Conti-
 nual Succession of their Bishops; their Immediate
 derivation from the Apostles; the Title to succeed S.
 Peter; the Multitude and Variety of people which are
 of their Persuasion; Apparent Consent with Antiqui-
 ty in many Ceremonials which other Churches have
 rejected; a pretended and sometimes an apparent
 Consent with some elder ages in many matters
 Doctrinal; the great Consent of one part with an-
 other in that which most of them affirm to be de-
 fide; the great Differences which are commenced
 amongst their Adversaries: Their happiness in be-
 ing Instruments in converting divers Nations:
 (he should rather have said, All) The Advanta-
 ges of Monarchical Government, the benefit of
 which as well as the Inconveniencies they dayly en-
 joy; the Piety and Austerity of their Religious
 Orders of men and women; the Single Life of their
 Priests and Bishops; the severity of their Fasts,
 and their Exterior Observances; the known Ho-
 linefs of some of those persons whose Institutes
 the Religious Persons pretend to imitate, &c.
 After which he subjoyns. These things and di-
 verse others may very easily persuade persons of
 much reason and more piety to retain that which
 they know to have been the Religion of their Fore-
 fathers, which had actual Possession and Seizure
 of men's Understandings before the opposit Profes-
 sions

sions had a name. Thus he. By which words 'tis Evident we have Probabilities and high ones too, on our side; else how could they be able *very easily to persuade persons of much reason?* especially, they having as he sayes *more piety; or more then much,* that is *very much;* which argues rather that those motives for Catholick Faith were *suatable to Piety or Truths;* or at least exceedingly-seeming-Pious; so as the *great Piety* of those persons, neither checkt at the practice according to those Motives, nor their *much Reason* reach't to a discovery of their Fallaciousness. Whence, we may gather farther than those Motives so standing for us, are to be rankt in the highest degree of Probability. For since those Persons are confest to be very *Pious,* that is, very Good, and, so, unapt to be byast by Passion, and withal to have *much Reason,* 'tis plain the Cause of their Assent to Catholick Faith must be look't for in the Object, and have a wonderful appearance at least of Evidence or highest Probability which is able to conquer and satisfy so Rational and sincere Understandings. This being so, my L^d. cannot in reason own himself a *Dissuader,* nor pretend his Discourse has power to *dissuade* any from our Faith, unless he put down the whole force of what we build our Faith on together with his motives why he judges it false, and then compare or *weigh* those reasons together, and so conclude his absolutely preponderating. I doubt those very motives

delivered faintly by himself though an Adversary, are such, as, had he laid them open at large as he does his own Objections, he would have been infinitely puzzled to find others to overballance them with any show of Reason. But I will not put him upon so large a task : Let him onely consider on what Grounds the Rule of our Faith is built, to wit on sensible and unmistakable matter of Fact from age to age, and this unmistakableness confirm'd supernaturally by the concern of the Thing, obliging the Beleevers best care to preserve it, and by the Goodness implanted in their hearts by Christ's Doctrin, which kept lively awake that care (as it is at large laid open in *Sure-Footing*) and then compare it with Descanting upon Scripture's Letter by Human Skills, which is the Ground of the Protestants Faith as contra-distinguish't from ours, (or rather of their Dissent or negative Tenets) and show those Grounds preponderating ours, and then his Reader will have some encouragement to heed his Dissuasive, otherwise he can have none.

Sixth Way.

10. **A** Sixth way is to demand of his L^r. if he will undertake the pretended *Evidences* he produces whether Reasons or Citations have not also been (pretended at least to be) *answer'd* by Learned men on our side, and that the

Indif-

Indifferent part of the world have judg'd the Catholicks were so evidently concluded against by the Protestants, that they were not able in reason to reply. However he ought to have alledg'd that in the Evidences he brings the Protestants have had the *last Reply*, that so at least there may be some sleight conjectural *likelihood* they were Unanswerable or Convictive. This, I say, seems in reason fit to have been voucht, and (as Natural Method requires it) plac'd at the very Entrance of his Book, so to give the Reader some faint hopes his perusing it might be perhaps to some purpose. What does my L. of *Downs*? He professes at the very beginning of his *Introduction* the direct contrary; For he confesses there that *the Evidences on both sides* (in questions of difference between our Churches) *have been so often produc'd, &c.* It will seem almost impossible to produce any new matter, or if we could (observe how unlikely he makes it he should conclude any thing) it will not be probable that what can be newly alledg'd can prevail more than all which already hath been so often urg'd in these Questions; He should after the words [*so often urg'd,*] have added and never answer'd, otherwise the *often urging* signifies nothing as to Convictiveness. Yet, careless of this, he proceeds; *But we are not deterr'd from doing our duty by any such considerations, as knowing that the same medicaments, &c.* Which, waving the pious Rhetorick, to any Understanding man signi-

signifies directly as much as if he should profess, *I am resolv'd to write a Book against the Papists whatever comes on't, or whether it be to purpose or no.* For, to confess he brings nothing but *common objections* without undertaking to manifest they were never satisfactorily answer'd, is to carry it as if meerly to *transcribe* were sufficient to *convince*; especially, since the being *often urg'd*, is a very probable Argument they have been also *often answer'd*.

Seventh Way.

11. **T**HE Seventh way to confute him is to run over his whole Book, bringing it into Heads; and then by disabling those Heads, overthrow the Book it self; noting first that I guid my Quotations by its Third Edition in *Octavo*.

First then we will distinguish it into the *Matter* of His *Dissuasive*, that is; those things on which he builds his pretence of Dissuading; and the *Manner* of it, or the *Way* he takes to manage that *matter*.

The matter is divided into his Authorities and his Reasons: Wee'l begin with his Authorities. And, because we have found and shew'd Dr. *Pierce's* so-fam'd Sermon to be the very *Idea* of inefficacious quoting: 'tis but reason we should manifest how the *Dissuasive* participates of its Nature, by ranking the Citations produc't in it under

der those ten faulty Heads which comprehend-
ed the other's Authorities.

To the First Head belong that of *Senensis* p. 21,
and 49. Those two p. 34. Those p. 46, and 52
Maldonat's p. 55. Those p. 68. Those noted
with *b, c, d, e,* and *f.* p. 88. *Aeneas Sylvius* p. 89.
Those three so maliciously and wilfully misrep-
resenting the Catholick Tenet. p. 94. To which
add that of *S. John* p. 104. That clutter of Ci-
tations p. 111. and that which follows. *Elutherius*
and *S. Ambrose* p. 113. His Scripture p. 121.
His general muster of such as wish't reformation
of manners in the Church 125, 126. Now, to
vindicate these Testimonies his *Lp.* should
show to what purpose as a Controvertist he al-
leg'd these more than for show. I note that
all these fall also under the 2^d, and 3^d. Head, and
perhaps diverse of the others.

To the 2^d. Head appertain, Those of *Tert. Bas.*
Theop. Alexandrinus in the Preface. *Tert.* p. 28.
S. Cypr. and *Dionysius* p. 57. *Ambrose*, *Hilary*
and *Macarius* p. 58. *Olympiodorus* and *Leo* p. 59.
His Scripture p. 60. and 61. *Justin* and *Origen*
p. 69. *Eusebius* and *Macarius.* p. 70. *Ephren*
and *Nazianz.* p. 71. Those p. 83, and 84. *Ori-*
gen p. 85. *Lyra* and those noted *g, h, i, k, l, m.*
p. 88, & 89. The Council of *Eliberis* and *S. Austin*
p. 100. *Cyprian.* p. 110, and 114. Those p. 115,
and 116. Against all these 'tis charg'd that they
are raw and unapply'd, onely saying something
in common which comes not home to the point.

Where-

Wherefore to validate them His L^p. must show the contrary.

To the third belong those p. 28. Those p. 42. *Innocent*. p. 47, and p. 92. *Clemens* and *Origen*. p. 98. *Epiph.* p. 100. Those p. 104, 105, 106, 107. *The Extravagants* p. 113. Those p. 117. and 123. *Chrysost.* p. 119. Of these he is to show that he has levell'd them directly at a question rightly stated. I charge him with the contrary, and add that most of his other Citations fall under this Faulty Head.

Under the 4th are rank't those p. 29, 30. Those p. 49. 50, 51, 56. *Lombard* p. 64. *A castro* p. 67. *S. Austin* p. 73. *S. Gregory* p. 118. *Canus*. p. 119. These either impugn a Word for a Thing, or some Circumstance or Manner for the Substance.

Under the 5th the whole pag. 48. and all those p. 62. which are evidently *Negative*; and, so, *Inconclusive*.

Under the sixth are comprehended his First p. 20. and his Second p. 21. *Bellarmin* and *Ger-son* p. 24. *Albertus* p. 43. *Roffensis* and *Polydor Virgil* p. 45. His first Citation p. 64. Which we affirm to be the Sayings of private Authours, or Schoolmen which others do or may contradict. To this Head also belong all those in a manner in his two last chapters, that is, in the better half of his Book.

To the 7th Head are related that of *S. Ambrose* in his Preface. *S. Austin* p. 5, and 6. Of the Empe-

Emperours p. 12. *Leo* the 10th. p. 16. *Pius* the 4th. p. 17. the *Ephesin* Council p. 23. The Council of *Trent* p. 25. Those three p. 37. *Nazianz.* p. 58. *Tertull.* p. 69. The two first p. 73. Those three p. 87. and that p. 90. Those first p. 98. *S. Greg.* p. 100. His descant on the 7th Synod p. 101. 102, 103. *Symmachus* p. 114. And, lastly, my *Ld. of Downs* his Testimony of himself the page before the Title page, so strangely misrepresenting the Minde of that Frontispiece. These I affirm to be false and not to signify the thing they are expressly quoted for. Diverse of them also are direct Disingenuities, with a craft in the managing of them which argues design, and are inexcusable by mistake.

To the Eighth belong those of *Athanasius*, *Lactantius* and *Origen* in the Preface. *S. Chrysostom* p. 72. *Theodoret* and *Gelasius* p. 74. In which 'tis easy to be made appear, the words are *ambiguous*.

Those of the 9th, or Sayings of Writers on his own side are not worth mentioning: nor yet the 10th. or pieces of Scripture interpreted by himself; unless he will show us he proceeds on Evident Principles in fencing them, which so force the meaning he gives them that they can possibly bear no other. Till he does this, all his glosses are presumable to have no other foundation but meer strength of Fancy; and since he professes (p. 9.) that his *Disuasive wholly relies* on Scripture, that is on the *sence* he conceives it to have, the common mode of interpreting Scripture by
Fancy

Fancy which reigns so in the world, will make any sober man doubt, unless he show us the evident Principles which necessitated his Interpretation, that his whole Dissuasive is perfectly built on his own Imagination.

The Dissuasive hath two or three other faulty Heads of Citations besides those mention'd; as *Unauthentick* ones: such is *Origens* p. 98. and that against the 7th. Synod p. 103. Those also which cite an Authour but no place where they are to be found as *S. Cyril* p. 99. And lastly, brought to impugn Faith, but speaking onely of Alterable practices, as those p. 123. which he is to show Authentick, well-cited and Pertinent; And as well of these as the former he is to make good if he will go to work like a solid man that they have in them the true nature of Testimonies, and such Certainty as may safely be rely'd on for Principles; of those serious Discourses he makes upon them. See *Sure-Footing* p. 172, 173, 174.

12. But that I may do right to the Dissuader, I am to confess ingenuously that he has in him one Citation which hath in it the true nature of a *Testimony*, or depending on the Authour's Knowledge had by *Sense* of the present Doctrine of the Church at that time. Now, though it be the Testimony only of one single Father, and so I am not in severity bound by Catholick Grounds which vouch onely *Consensus Patrum*, (which I understand to mean a Consent of so many and

so

so qualify'd as is apt to convince) to answer it, and not at all by Protestant Grounds which yield them all Fallible; yet I have that regard for any thing that tends (though remotely) to *Solidity*, that I will even remit something of my own advantage to give it a respectful Consideration. The Testimony is of *Gennadius* cited by my L. p. 58, & 59. thus. *For, after Christ's Ascension into Heaven the Souls of all Saints are with Christ, and going from the body they go to Christ, expecting the resurrection of their body, with it to pass into the perfection of perpetual bliss.* To which my L^d. subjoyns, *and this he delivers as the Doctrin of the Catholick Church.* I take this excellent Testimony as put down by himself, to do which the usage of *St. Greg. Nazianzen's* immediately foregoing, gives me small encouragement. In answer then, I affirm that this Testimony so insisted and rely'd on as against us, is as plain a declaration of the Faith of our Church at present as any now-adayes Catholick could pronounce. For, since no Catholick holds that any goes to Purgatory but they who die *Sinners* to some degree, and that all who are *Saints* are *with Christ in Heaven*, as is evident by the Churches common language affirming constantly *the Saints are in Heaven*, and never that the *Saints are in Purgatory*, but the *Souls* onely, 'tis manifest that the words are as expressly for us as we our selves could invent or wish.

I hope it will not wrōg Method, if on this occasion

I show how Protestant Writers speed when they bring against us any Testimony of a Father speaking as a Father, that is, declaring that he delivers the sence of the Catholick Church; however in other Testimonies which speak not narratively, or matter of Fact, the very nature of words joyn'd with the variety of their Circumstances must needs afford room for ambiguity and several Glosses. I affirm then that this Testimony not onely is not in the least opposit to us, but is directly opposit to the Protestants in another point of Faith in which we differ. To discover this let us reflect on the words [*After Christs Ascension into Heaven the Souls of all Saints are with Christ,*] and ask what mean these words *After Christs Ascension*? And first 'tis Evident it puts a distinction between the Souls of Saints *before Christs Ascension* and *After it* in some Respect, and what is this Respect? most expressly this that the Souls of the Saints *After Christs Ascension* go from the body to Christ, that is, that *before the Ascension* none did. The avow'd Doctrin of the Catholick Church, professing that those who die Saints in the Law of Grace go straight to Heaven, but that the best Saints before our Saviours dying for them and Ascending with them, did not. Whence also we hold that Christ's *descending into Hell*, was to free them from that State of Suspence and Want of their strongly desir'd and hop't for *Bliss*. According to that Hymn of S. Ambrose and S. Augustine,

gust in, in the Common-prayer-book, so oft said over by rote but never reflected on, *When thou hadst overcome the Sharpness of death thou didst open the Kingdome of Heaven to all Believers*: Signifying plainly that no Believers sound Heaven open for them till after Christ's death. By the Success of this one Testimony is seen how utterly the Protestant Cause would be overthrown by way of Testimony as well as Reason, were Citations distinguish't, brought to Grounds, and those onely admitted from the Fathers in which 'tis manifest they speak *as Fathers* or Witnesses of what is the present Churches doctrine.

To close up this Discourse about the Dissuader's Citations. He is to show us first that they fall not under the Faulty Heads to which they are respectively assign'd, or under diverse others of those Heads. Next, that they have in them the nature of *Testimonies*: And, lastly, (which is yet harder) that though they have in them the nature of *Testimonies*, their Authority is *Certain* and their language *unambiguous* so that they may be safely rely'd on for Principles or Grounds of a solid Discourse; This if he shows of any one citation which strikes at our Faith, I promise him very heartily to subscribe to the validity of all the rest.

13. Thus much for his Authorities. Next should follow a Refutation of his Reasons produc'd against our Faith; for, as for those against our School-Divines or Casuists they concern not me as a Con-

trovertist: Let him and them fight it out. Now, Reasons that strike at our Faith must either be against the *Ground* of Faith, and those shall be consider'd in my Answer to his First Section; or against *points* of Faith: And these, may proceed two wayes; First by showing those points Incomprehensible to our Natural Reason, or unsutable to our Fancy; and this way he frequently takes, making a great deal of game upon such subjects, as any Atheist may do by the same way in points common to him and us. But this hurts us not in the least; in regard we hold not Mysteries of Faith Objects of Human Reason; nor Spiritual Things the Objects of Fancy; and, so, these Reasons need no farther Answer. The other way Reasons against Points of Faith may proceed, is to show those Points contradictory to some Evident Principles, at least to some other known or else acknowledg'd Truth? And these were worth answering; But such as these I find none in his whole Book, rather that he builds his sleight Descants or Discourses on some controvertible Text or Citation, relying on them as firmly as if they were First Principles.

Indeed p. 65. the Dissuader tells us of a *Demonstration* of his for the Novelty of Transubstantiation and that a *plain* one too: But, I shal manifest shortly from the very words of the Author *Peter Lombard*, on which his *Plain Demonstration* relies, that 'tis either a *plain mistake* or *plain Abuse* of him; nay argues the *direct contrary* to what the Dissuader product it for.

Some Consequences also he deduces *ad hominem* against diverse points of our Faith, built on our own Concessions or Allow'd Truths taken from the Fathers; by which he attempts to overthrow it: But these Consequences are so strangely Inconsequent, and those tenets he would counterpose so far from Contradictory, that 'tis hard to imagin whence his Reason took its rise to leap into such remote Conclusions. The instance in two, found p.49, and 50. That the *Conflagration of the last day*, and the Opinion of some Fathers that *the Souls were detain'd in secret receptacles till the day of Judgment*, do both destroy *intermediate Purgatory*. Which Consequences if he will make good, I will yield his whole Book to be Demonstrative and Unanswerable.

In a word, all the good Reasons he brings, are taken from some of our Divines writing against others, and he hath done himself the right to chuse the best; which levell'd against the opinion of a less able Divine in stead of a point of Faith, must needs bear a very plausible show.

14. Next follows the *Manner* how he manages this *Matter*; which in the civillest Expressions I use I must call so many sleights to delude his Reader; and those so craftily couched that none but a Scholler can discern the snare.

The first and Fundamental one is his wilfully mis-stating the Question all over. As p. 16. when he confounds the making new Symbols or Creeds, which signifies the *putting together* into a Profes-

sion of Faith Articles formerly-held (as did S. *Athanasius* and the *Nicene Council*) with *making new Articles*. All his whole Section 3^d. of *Indulgences*, which he makes to signify meerly those which pardons sins or pains after this life ; whereas yet himself confesses p. 40. that those were not defin'd by our Church. So also his next Section of Purgatory, by which we mean a Penal State for those who die imperfectly contrite, and from which they are deliverable by the prayers of the Church Militant : Instead of which he impugns sometimes material Fire, sometimes the duration of it. It were tedious to reckon all his Faults in this kind, scarce one point escapes this voluntary misprision ; that is, he scarce discourages steadily (though perhaps he may glance at it accidentally) against one point of our Faith rightly stated or as taken in the declarative words of our Church. Now, common Honesty telling us that if one be to impugn any mans Tenet, the first thing natural method leads him to is to put down that man's very words profess'd by him to express his Tenet, and not what others deem, conceit or talk about the same matter ; my L^d. ought in due candour have first produc't the words of the Council of *Trent*, and then have level'd his opposition against *them* : and not have told us what School-divines say about the point ; or (having thus conceal'd the point it self) argu'd against some Circumstance or Manner of it instead of the Substance. Now
this

this kind of carriage so evidently preternatural, and so constantly us'd, forces me to judge it sprung from voluntary Insincerity and not from Accident or Inadvertency.

15. His second Disingenuity at once Evidences and aggravates the former. 'Tis this, that, when by such a management he hath made the point odious, he uses to bring in our Churches Tenet in the rear; and, whereas Her speaking abstractedly frees her absolutely from the invidious particularities he would fasten on her Faith, he (as if he had resolv'd to abuse her, right or wrong) makes that very thing which should clear her tend to *disgrace* her more: As is seen p. 40. where he is forc't to confess our Church defin'd *Indulgences* onely *in general terms* (that is, none of his former Discourses so particularizing toucht her or her Faith) and then cries out the Council *durst not* do this nor the other: That is, she *durst not* do, and consequently *did not* do, what all his former discourse would persuade the world our Church *had* done: Worse then this is his Instance p. 60. where after he had pretended in the whole 4th. Section to impugn Purgatory, which he had confounded with School-opinions to p. 45. with the time of delivery p. 48. 51. 56. with a state of merit or demerit p. 57. 58. with his own Parenthesisses p. 59. and told us some stories of Revelations and Apparitions which seem'd to him most ridiculous; Lastly confounded it with *Simon Magus* his Opinion, *Plato's* or *Cicero's*

conceit, and *Virgils Fiction*; After all this he adds, *this doctrine which in all the parts of it is uncertain, and in the late Additions to it in Rome is certainly false, is yet with all the Faults of it past into an Article of Faith by the Council of Trent.* Now these big words *All the parts of it, the late Additions, All the Faults of it*, and all these said to be *past into an Article of Faith by the Council of Trent*, would make one think that Council had defin'd all that medley he had huddled together, for Christian Faith; but looking in the Council, not a Syllable of any of these is to be found, but barely these few words, that *There is a Purgatory, and that the Souls there detain'd are help't by the prayers of the Faithful.* Where we see but *two parts* at most, for there are but *two Propositions* in the whole definition: Again, *the late Additions* which he sayes are defin'd by the Council can be but *one* at most, that is, the second Proposition, that those Souls are help't by the Faithfull's prayers; And lastly, when he sayes *this Doctrine of Purgatory with all its Faults is past by the Council into an Article of Faith*, the large word *All its Faults* can mean onely the same second Proposition; there being nothing defin'd, besides the very doctrine of Purgatory it self, but *this*. Which kind of carriage of his, so sinisterly descanting on the point all along, not pretending to put down our *Tepet* at all till towards the End, then deforming it to be a bundle of God knows how many Faults defin'd for

for Faith, putting all these upon the Council of Trent, and yet avoiding to put down the words of the Council at all (though so few) lest they should discover he had lavish't out at randome, show evidently the Dissuader stands not much upon Conscience or Sincerity, so he can colour, and hide his disingenuities, and he is the greatest master of that craft I ever yet met with. Now, to avoid this Calumny (it being frequent in his book) I discourse thus, Points of Faith are Supreme Truth which stand in the abstract, and 'tis the work of Divines not of the Church-Representative to draw long trains of Consequences from them, and dive particularly into the Manners how they are to be explicated, or into their Extents if it be some Power: Nor is this particular in the point of Indulgences or Purgatory, but is found in all the other points of Faith, as every learned Divine knows very well. Again, 'tis against the Principles of Universal & Supream Government for a Church Representative defining Faith to descend out of its highest Sphere and engage in particularities (especially if they belong not to them, as School-opinions do not) but only to order in common, and leave the Application of their Common Orders to those who are to execute, or to Inferiour Officers; and, should they engage in particulars which are both below their highest office, and oft-times contingent and uncertain, they would commit the greatest imprudence in the world. Since then my L^d acknow-

ledges here p. 40. that the Council orders *all hard and Subtil questions concerning Purgatory, all that is suspected to be false, and all that is uncertain, and whatever is curious and superstitious, and for filthy lucre be laid aside*, he should have shown that it befitted a Council's Gravity to descend to particulars, or to define negatively to the School-opinion concerning the Churches Treasure, and not rather order in Common and leave it to Inferior Officers to execute as circumstances should work upon their Prudence: which is, that in Opinions which pretend a Subordination to and Coherence with Faith, Divines should first clear their Incoherence with it ere They engage their Authority against them, and then to do it efficaciously being back't with the Majesty of the Council's Orders.

My L^d's words that the Fathers of the Council *set their Doctors as well as they can to defend all the new, curious and scandalous Questions, and to uphold the gainful trade*, is indeed to the purpose, but wishal (by his leave) an unhand-some and most false Calumny against so many Persons of Honour and Quality; and so Invidious a Charge, that could he have prov'd it, he had not flubber'd it over so carelessly without offering any proof for it but his bare word; nor with a sleight proper to himself, immediately after he had directly charged it, have half recanted it with *However it be with them*: that is, whether they *did any such thing or no*, as he had so lately

lately and so pressingly challeng'd them to *have done*. And this I note as a *Third Head* of his *disingenuity*, frequent in his Book; that he brings very good proofs for diverse particulars which concern not our Church, but when it comes to the very point and which directly strikes at her, his own bare word, *We know*, or, *it is Certain*, (p. 54. l. 22. p. 62. p. 63. p. 67. &c.) is the best Argument he produces.

16. A fourth disingenuity is his Perverting wilfully the Intention of Catholick Authours. How he hath dealt with the Council of *Trent* in the two late mention'd points of *Indulgences* and *Purgatory* is already shewn. In like manner has he treated the *Expurgatory Indies*; For, whereas by the word *Purgari* & *emaculari* in a Citation of his own p. 21, 'tis manifest they meant but to amend Corruptions of the late by the Antient Copies, he makes as though out of gripes of *Conscience* (forsooth) *that the Fathers were not right on our side*, they had therefore purposely gone about to corrupt the Fathers themselves, (p. 18. and 19.) so to make them on our side because we could not find them so. An Attempt impossible to fall into head of any man not stark mad; For this altering the Fathers could not have serv'd our turn unless we had made it known and publish't it; and, if made Publick could not be imagin'd to do the deed neither, for the Fraud must needs be made as Publick as the Book; So that an Action thus intended must
be

be a Human Action without a Motive or Reason, which is a Contradiction. / Worse is what follows p. 21, & 22. but withal the malice of it is more easily discoverable : For 'tis evident by the particulars he mentions in those Indexes or Tables that the Printer or Correcter who made them was an Heretick, and put in those Tables what his perverseness imagin'd was found in the Fathers : Whence it was but fit his whole Index should be expung'd : Not that we fear the Fathers, but that we disallow the wicked intentions of the Index-maker, who abuses the Fathers to injure us.

So p. 62. he would make Catholikes themselves *dissatisfy'd* of the *Ground of Transubstantiation*, because they say 'tis not express'd in Scripture : as if Catholiks held that nothing could be of Faith but whats expressly found there ; whereas he well knows they universally teach and hold the contrary. But his abuse of *Peter Lombard* p. 64. & 65. is very remarkable, though perhaps it might spring out of his little Experience in School-divinity. To make *Transubstantiation* seem a Novelty he would persuade his Reader *Lombard* sayes, *he could not tell whether there was any Substantial change or no* : Whereas that Authour Dist. 10. brings Testimonies of the Fathers to prove it, and concludes thence that 'Tis evident that the Substance of Bread is converted into Christ's Body, and the Substance of Wine into his Blood, which is what the Council of

Trent

Trent calls *Transubstantiation*. And there ends that Distinction; After which immediately succeeds the 11th. *De modis Conversionis*, Of the Manners of this Conversion; and of these he sayes he cannot sufficiently define whether *this Conversion* be *Formal*, or *Substantial*, or of another kind. So that *Substantial* here supposes the Conversion of the Substance of Bread into Christ's Body, and is put by him onely to signify one of the manners of this Conversion; which he explicates to be, *Sic Substantiam converti in Substantiam ut hæc essentialiter fiat illa*, that one Substance is so converted into another Substance that the one is made essentially the other. Whereas others who also hold *Transubstantiation* do yet explicate that Conversion by putting the body of Christ to succeed under the same Accidents in place of the Substance of Bread annihilated. Now this Manner of Conversion (call'd by him a Substantial Manner, in opposition to *Formal*, which he makes to be a Conversion both of Substance and Accidents, and not in Opposition to the change of one Substance into another) he leaves Undefined; but the Conversion it self of the Substance of Bread into the body of Christ which is our point, he both defines, hold, proves out of Fathers (Disc. 10.) and calls them *Hereticks* that deny it: How unfortunate is my L. to quote an Authour as not holding *Transubstantiation*, then to call that Citation a *plain Demonstration* that it was *not known in his dayes*; whereas he both

pro-

professes to hold it, and, by alledging Fathers for it, evidences he holds it was held anciently; and, lastly, gives my L. such hard language for not holding it himself. Whether it be likely my L. should light by some accident in reading *Peter Lombard* onely on the 11th. Dist. and never read or light on the end of the 10th. let Indifferent men judge. I onely desire the Reader to observe how ill my L. comes off with his *plain Demonstration*, and to remark that he ever succeeds worst when he most aymes at a good and solid proof; the reason of which is because Truth being Invincible, the neerer one closes to grapple with her the worse still he is foil'd. Those few Instances may suffice for the 4th. Kind of the Dissuaders disingenuities, which is to pervert the Intentions of his Authours; of which sort, were it worth the pains, I would undertake to show neer an hundred in my L^{ds}. *Dissuasive*. This piece of Art being now so customary to him that 'tis even grown into a second Nature.

17. His fifth kind of disingenuity is a most wilful one and most frequent too, for it takes up far the better half his book. 'Tis this that he rakes up together all the less solid or ill Opinions and Cases (and sometimes deforms the good ones) of some private Writers in the Church which he will needs lay upon the Church her self as Mistress of our Faith. Nay, so strangely unjust he is in this Particular, that whereas it evidently

clears

clears our Faith, disengages the Church, and shows it but Opinion when other Catholick Doctors uncontrolledly write against such an Opinion or Explication, himself often alledges that very thing which should clear the Church, and and makes use of it to her farther disgrace; First, making the *School* and *Church*, *Private Opinions*, or Explications and *Faith* all one; and, at next, that the difference amongst such Opiners and Explicaters argues our difference in Faith; How strange a malice is this! Was there ever any time since the Apostles in which there were not in the Church diverse persons and even some Governours bad in their lives, and also Erroneous in their Opinions, when the Abstractedness of Christian Faith restrain'd not their Understandings from descending to particulars nor secur'd them in such discourses depending much upon human Sciences? Do not the best Champions of Protestants object to the Ancient Fathers themselves such Errors in Opinions? Yet no ancient Heretick was ever so weak as to make that an Argument against the Church of those times. Did not many Protestant Writers hold many Roman-Catholick Tenets, as may be seen at large in the Protestants Apology? Yet no Catholick in his Wits thought therefore the Church of *England* her self was Roman-Catholick, I have heard that one of their Chief Ecclesiastical Officers, namely Bishop *Bilson*, writ a book purposely to justify the *Hollanders* Rebellion against the King
of

of *Spain*, maintaining that Subjects might in some Cases rise against their Sovereigns and turn them out of their Government? And yet Catholics are far from that peevishness to esteem the Protestants disloyal in their Principles but honour them highly for the contrary Virtue, even though they are pleas'd to permit us their Fellow-sufferers for the same loyal Cause, to be abus'd and branded publicly for Traytors by every disloyal Scribbler. And, to come neerer home, did not my L. himself formerly write some strange Opinions, (I need not name them) yet no Catholick was ever so absurd as to charge his Church with those Tenets. But, which is yet far worse, he imputes to the Catholick Church such licentious Cases, which not onely Private Authours may and do freely contradict but even Multitudes of Church-Officers, namely almost all the Bishops in *France* in Diocesan Synods, nay the Head of the Church himself has disapproov'd in condemning the Apology writ for them. Yet, for all this, all must be our Churches fault whether she will or no; and our Doctrin, though she condemns it. Was ever such a disingenuous Writer heard of! But what aggravates most the Case is, neither the Church of *England* nor the Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*, nor any Officer or Bishop of hers that we heard of did ever in any solemn Act blemish those Authours cited in the Protestants Apology by condemning their Books, nor yet those writ by the

the Dissuader, though they judg'd them amiss; but, on the contrary his person is advanc't and chosen for their Champion; and yet our Writers are soberer & more candid than to impute to their Church any of these not-yet-disavow'd Faults, whereas my Ld. (for want of better Proofs) will needs clap upon our Church any misreasonings of private men, though our chief Church Governour and many Inferiour ones have discountenanc't and blemish't them. Nor is it onely every defect human nature is liable to in reasoning or acting which must be made our Churches Crimes, but every unfavorable Circumstance Man's Nature can light into, and their defective Effects are all made by the Dissuader's Logick to spring from meer Popery; nay the very National Rudeness of his wild *Irish* is (in his Preface) confounded by his carriage with our Churches Doctrine; and the Inability of their Teachers with much Rhetorick complain'd of, and character'd to be Popery, when himself enjoys the revenue which should educate them better and encourage them.

Against this kind of unreasonable procedure in the Dissuader, I levell'd those Corollaries from Corol. 31. to. 40. which I intreat my Reader to review and him to consider particularly. In the mean time I would ask him on this occasion a few short Questions. May not any one remain a Catholick, and never hold or practice these Cases and Opinions? Do not Catholicks impugn
them

them as much as Protestants? Does he find any of
 those Opinions or Cases in our Catechisms, or any
 Command of our Church to hold or act them,
 nay even in that most common point of extending
 Indulgences to the next world; but they who
 will use them, may, who will not, need not?
 How then does he hope to dissuade from Catho-
 lick Religion, by impugning that which touches
 not that Religion nor concerns any ones being of
 it? And why does not he rather fear all sober
 men will see his aim by this declamatory kind
 of Opposition to endeavour to gain credit as a
 great Anti-papist, and not to convince solidly
 his Readers, whose experience (if they know
 any thing) enables them to give a ready and
 satisfactory answer in their own thoughts to all
 those Questions I have now ask't, and so, to
 confute neer three parts of His Book. He saw
 it himself, and though he carries it on all along
 as if he were willing all should be thought the
 Doctrin of our Church or Faith, yet, fearing
 the Calumny is too manifest to be cloak't, he
 provides excuses and Evasions before hand, in
 his Title (p. 127.) saying, *The Church of Rome,*
AS IT IS AT THIS DAY DISORDER'D,
teaches doctrines and uses practices which are in
themselves or in their immediate CONSEQUEN-
CES direct Impieties, &c. So that he speaks of
 our Church precisely as having some disorders
 in her, and that they lead to ill onely by Con-
 sequences drawn from such disorderly Tenets; and
 who's

who's the drawer of these Consequences? Himself. But, grant his position that there are Disorders in the Church (I mean not in Faith, held Universally and obligatorily, but in unobligatory Opinions and Practices) I ask does he think there was ever any time in which there were not some Disorders in the Church, or ever will be while Original corruption lasts? Does he think the very time of the Apostles was exempt from such frailty; or that *S. Paul* complain'd for nothing of the Pastors in those primitive and purest times (*Phil. 2. v. 21.*) that *Omnes quæ sua sunt querunt non quæ sunt Jesu Christi!* Again, thinks he it any wonder that a disorder'd Tenet or a Falshood in a point belonging to manners is apt to lead *by consequence* to ill actions; none doubting but that as Virtue is the connatural Effect of Truth, so is Vice of Falshood. What hath he got then by this kind of Proceeding, taking up better half his book? Onely this, he hath prov'd there is Original Sin in the world, and so it's Effects, Ignorance and Interest; Again, let him consider how disputative an Age this last Century has been, and what infinit multitudes of Writers concerning Opinionative Points of all sorts have been in our Church, how voluminous, how descending to particulars, or Cases, and this both in School-divinity, Morals and Canon-Law; and then let him speak seriously whether he can conceive it possible in human Nature, there should not be much Contingency in such

an Universality depending on their private Reasons; whereas scarce two men debating the same point particularly, can light into the self-same Consequences, but differ in their deductions. Thinks he it possible many should not be Ignorant and so miscarry casually, many Passionate and incline to some Tenets because sutable to their humour; many conceited of their new Inventions, and thence, judging their Consequence to be connected with the point of Faith, cry it up to be *de fide* in their opinion, and alledge that, denying *this*, you by consequence deny *Faith*? This being so, nay impossible to be otherwise, and every Reader that sees the Dissuader's unreasonableness against us easily judging he would pick out the worst Instances he could find in that Infinity of Authours, and (the very complexion of his style being wholly Invidious) expose them to shame with all the most disgraceful Rhetorick so great a wit as his heighten'd by that bitterest of Passions could deliver; he will easily be able to make an Estimate what he may judge of my L^d's performance in this kinde.

18. But now what's all this to to our Church? For his Title p. 127. tells us 'tis *the Church of Rome* which *teaches such Doctrins* and *uses such Practices*, &c. The Notion of *Church*, as one would conceive, is terminated and bounded precisely within the limits of its Definition, *a Body of the Faithful*; and Logick tells every one who under-

understands it, that, since we work by abstracted notions, or conceive a thing now thus, now otherwise, we must not confound those notions but hold strictly to the formal meaning of the word which expresses the thing we undertake for. We are then to expect in honesty, that, since the Dissuader charges all those Doctrins and Practices on our Church, all his Testimonies to fasten them on her should be of our Churches words, or Expressions of the Churches Faith; we need not doubt then but they will all be Definitions of General Councils. Let the Margent inform us. The first Citation is of *Navarr's Enchiridion*, a private Casuist. The 2^d. of *Reginaldus*, another Casuist. The 3^d, and 4th, of *Sotus* and *Medina*, two other School-Divines. Then comes in *Reginaldus* again, & then *Sotus* again; & in this tenour he proceeds for 133 pages; that is from p. 127, to p. 260. not quoting the Council of *Trent* past 3, or 4. times (but once, as I remember, the words of that Council) and as oft abusing It by his strange misconstructions.

19. For instance take his first Quotation of that Council p. 135; which I the more insist on, because on that occasion I shall lay open his crafty and voluntary defiling every point he touches with most abominable misrepresentations, and those vizarded with an outward form of Holiness and such devout expressions as a Saint from Heaven would scarce use, lest prudent men should

think it too much; which I intended for a **SIXTH** Head of his disingenuities:

After then p. 133, and 134. he had made all the most odious Cases he could pick out *the Roman Doctrin*, because the books of three or four Authours perused and allow'd by two or three others as not opposit to Faith; (See Coroll. 33.) that is, the private Reasons of half a dozen Divines conceiv'd so, which he amplifies beyond all bounds of moderation, that one would judge a General Council or Provincial one, at least that many Church Governours or Bishops had recommended those Cases to be held and follow'd; at length he tells you sadly p. 134. that *This, though INFINITLY INTOLERABLE, yet it is but the BEGINNING OF SORROWS*; Then follow the *SUPER-INFINIT Sorrows* themselves; the first of which *Sorrows* is the Council of *Trent's* Doctrin; and, if it be *Naught*, 'tis certainly the *Chief* of them, and so (had I a word to express it so high which the Dissuader's Rhetorick would easily reach) it should be phras'd something above *Super-infinitt*; in regard by the Sacredness of it's Authority it would be a Ground and an Abetment to all the wicked Cases issuing from it. Ere I come to examin it I premise this note that such Testimonies as *This* are onely to my L^{d's} purpose if he will argue against our Churches Doctrin; In the success of these then lies the whole Trial of our Cause. We have seen how he has sped formerly in his *plain Demonstra-*

tion and his onely efficacious Testimony of a Father; let's see how he thrives in this, which we must acknowledge beyond all Evasion to express the sence of our Church.

20. His last ¶. then p. 134. begins with describing a true and Perfect Contrition and its Sacred Recommends as sufficient to blot out Sin; All this is well; nor is there, as far as I know, a Catholic like in the world that was ever taught otherwise; what follows? Yet, sayes he, *the Church of Rome does not allow it to be of any value unless it be joyn'd with a desire to confess their sins to a Priest, saying, that a man by Contrition is not reconcil'd to God without their Sacramental or Ritual Pennance actual or votive. And this is decreed by the Council of Trent, &c.* Then comes thundring in a Declamation fraught with such Invidious yet Holy Rhetorick that any honest unexamining Reader would almost lay his Salvation on't, he had all the Reason in the world. *Which things* (adds he) *besides that is against Scripture, & the promises of the Gospell, and not onely teaches for Doctrins the Commandments of Men, but evacuates the Goodness of God by their Traditions, and weakens & discourages the best repentance & prefers repentance towards men before that which the Scripture calls Repentance towards God, & Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.* And there ends his paragraph, in which his passion was in such hast that he forgot to add an *Also* to answer to the word *Besides*. Now L^d have mercy upon us!

What strangely wicked Doctrine is this which can occasion such a clutter of Devotion and Ineffectiveness jumbled together! Attend Reader, and from one Instance which I pick't not out purposely, but took the first that my discourse led me to accidentally, learn the nature of all the rest; for scarce one passage in his whole book is free from this Fault.

The Council Sess. 14. as it is commonly reckon'd, (not 4th, as perhaps his Printer mistook it) c. 4. speaks of *Contrition*; which it distinguishes into *Perfect Contrition*, the same my L^d describes; and declares that *It reconciles a man to God before this Sacrament (to wit, of Penance) be actually received*; and *Imperfect* or *Attrition*, springing from *Consideration of the wiliness of Sin, or fear of Hell*, not from Love of God as its motive; and to *this* it requires *actually* the Sacrament of *Penance*, this being properly efficacious to advance by Preparations to it beforehand, (which *Attrition* gives them will to make use of) and the whole course of Exercises in it or belonging to it, that *Attrition* into *perfect* or properly call'd *Contrition*: And (speaking of the first sort or proper *Contrition*,) It adds farther, that *Reconciliation to God is not to be ascrib'd (ipso Contritioni sine Sacramenti voto QUOD IN ILLA INCLUDITUR) to Contrition without desire of the Sacrament WHICH IS INCLUDED IN IT*; that is, *in Contrition*. Thus the Council. I note

First,

First, the Dissuaders craft in not putting down the words of the Council. A practice frequent with him (as I shew'd before) and purposely omitted, as appear'd evidently then and will do more now, because not at all favourable to his insincere humour of deforming all he meddles with.

Next, by this means, he, handling onely *Perfect Contrition*, makes our Church require *actual or votive Penance* to *Its Sufficiency*; Whereas the Council expressly voids any necessity of actual Penance to this or proper Contrition, and onely requires it to *Attrition*.

3^{ly}. He omits the words *which is included in it*; which put down had disannull'd all his whole discourse and cleared our Church from all his Calumnies; For this shows the Councils sense to be that Contrition alone, if qualify'd as it ought to be, reconciles to God; but that to be qualify'd as it ought to be, it *includes* a purpose or desire of doing other duties incumbent on the sinner by reason of his Sin; and signalizes this particularly of his duty to the Church in resolving to come to the Sacrament of Penance. Let us parallel it. Suppose the Council had said. *True sorrow for sin will save you; but not, unless you have a will to restore what you have stoln, for otherwise your sorrow is not true, in regard true sorrow for sin includes a will to rectify what sin had disorder'd.* Where's now the occasion of

my L^{ds}. ranting declamation of the Councils going against Scripture, and the promises of the Gospel, teaching for Doctrins the Commandments of men, of evacuating the goodness of God by Traditions, of weakening and discouraging the best Repentance, and of preferring Repentance towards men, before that which the Scripture calls Repentance towards God and Faith in our L^d. Jesus Christ. Yet, supposing that sinners are commanded by Christs Law to give account of their Souls to the Church and receive their Absolution and Pennance from her, as well as they are to restore what's stoln, the case is undeniably parallell.

But, since many other duties are included in Contrition, as an obligation to restore credit or goods unjustly taken away, to repair temporal damages our Neighbours have incurr'd by us, and the spiritual ones of Scandal, asking pardon for affrontive Injuries, curing our former Uncharitableness and wordliness by giving Almes, and such like : a purpose of all which, if our Contrition be right, ought to be included in it ; 'tis worth Enquiry why the Council particularises this of coming to the Sacrament of Pennance. And to Catholicks who understand the nature of that Sacrament, the Answer is so easy that 'tis needless. For, after the heart is contrite or substantially turn'd, there remains no more to be done but to wash of the tainture of bad Inclinations Mortal Sin uses to leave behind it, and

to make Satisfaction to our Neighbour or the World : Wherefore, because the whollome Sacrament of Pennance, rightly us'd, is ordain'd and apt of its own Nature both to wash away those remaining staines by sorrowful and penall actions enjoynd by Church disciplin, and also to ty men to the Execution of all due Satisfaction to the injur'd World; hence, the heart being truly converted interiorly, this Sacrament is the most Efficacious means to set all else right, & so to come to it is the onely remaining duty (as including all else) and for that reason 'tis particularly exprest by the Council that true Contrition must *include* a purpose to come to it; because, if true, it must needs include a desire to take the best means to rectify what's amiss. And, lest a Sinner should be apt to conceit and say within himself thus, I am truly sorry for my offending God, there is then no more to be thought on; the Council most prudently declares that, That will not do unless they desire likewise to set right what they had disorder'd, of which the Church is to be the Judge and careful Overseer, and so 'tis their duty to the Church to let her take Cognizance of it. The Dissuader did ill then to phrase it *Ritual Pennance*, as if onely a dry Ceremony had been enjoynd by the Council ere the Soul could be *reconcild* to God, whereas 'tis a Sacrament of its own nature executively satisfactory of all the kinds of duties, and efficaciously reparative of all the disorders which are the

the Arrears and Effects of a sinful Action: But he did worse to omit the Councils words, and so leave out totally *Quod in illâ includitur*, which candidly put in had made all his Process to no purpose: But worst of all, when he could not but see all this, to inveigh against so innocent, so rational, charitable and wise Proceedure of this Grave and Venerable Council with the harshest Expressions that ever were clad in Holy Language. And, it were good my Ld. who is so high against our Casuists, would let us know by what Cases he guides himself in his whole Book, where he sprinkles Scripture Holy-water all over as if every thing were a Devil he met with, and here particularly, in wilfully publicly and causelessly calumniating not a private person, but an whole Council consisting of so great a multitude of the most Grave, most Venerable, and most Sacred Personages in the whole Christian World.

21. A seventh kind of his Disingenuities is his Exaggerating and magnifying manner of Expression; by virtue of which he can make any *mote* seem a *Beam*; and though the Fault would ly in a very small room, perhaps require none at all, yet, as men blow up Bladders with wind, he can so swell and puff it up by plying it with his aiery Rhetorick, that it looks as big as a mountain; whereas come neer it, examin and grasp it, that will not now fill your hand which before took up the whole prospect of your Eye. He
can

can also by placing things in false lights make even the greatest Virtue seem a Vice, and then make that new-created vice a monstrous one; Both which were visibly discovered in our last Instance out of the Council of *Trent*.

22. I pass by many other of his petty Disingenuities; as his interposing Parentheses of his own; speaking most confidently where he has least Ground, so to make up the want of *this* with abundance of *the other*. His confounding good Cases with bad; Some private Bigotteries with acts of true Piety; Books approv'd by the Church with those of private Authours; understanding *spiritual* things grossly and *materially*; as in his whole business of Exorcisms: In which, were I in as merry an humour as his *LP.* is there, I could make his discourse there far more ridiculous than he makes any thing found in the Churches Ritual, which book we are onely to defend or he to object, if he would deal candidly. Himself confesses the Inquisition of *Spain* corrected one of those Books, he names, and I know no obligation any man has either to use or abet the others; and then to what purpose were they brought against the Church?

23. The last greatest and most notorious disingenuity is his most unworthy and most Intolerable Calumny against all Catholicks that they are Traytors, and unfit for human Society. He names not these words but that he endeavours to have the thing belev'd by his Readers appears thus:

thus: The Title of his third Chapter, p. 260. is this: *The Church of Rome teaches Doctrins which in many things are destructive of Christian society in General, and of Monarchy in special.* We see here what he charges on our Church: and, since 'tis known all Catholicks not onely are oblig'd to hold, but to hold as *sacred* and of *Faith* what the Church of Rome teaches, nay, to be ready to dy for that Faith, 'tis plain his Endeavours are to make us pass in the Opinion of his Readers for persons who hold Treason and Villany *Lawful*, nay *Sacred*, and that we are ready to dy and hope to be sav'd by such damnable points of Faith. Nor will his false-hearted Pretence, p. 462. exempt any, while 'tis known that nothing is more deeply rooted in our hearts than our obligation to believe as the Church believes and teaches. In particular he assures his Reader, p. 462. that, *No Contracts, Leagues, Societies, Promises, Vows or Oaths, are sufficient security to him that deals with one of the Church of Rome:* And p. 279. that the Doctrins of our Church are *great Enemies to the Dignity and Security, to the Powers and Lives of Princes.*

'Tis not fit we should use here the Language proper to express what's the due return and genuine brand for so malicious a Calumny: But perhaps it were not unfit nor injuring the modesty of Subjects humbly to beg Protection for our Innocence against the virulent tongues and pens

of our uncharitable accusers; whom neither Reason nor Experience will restrain from going on still to stigmatize us all with the Faults of a few rash (or sometimes misconstru'd) Writers. But when writes the Dissuader this? After such fresh Testimonies of the unanimous Loyalty of Catholicks to His sacred Majesty and his Royal Father, spending their lives and Fortunes in his service. And against whom? Against a Multitude in which are found very many Noble and Honourable Personages, and many thousands of others very considerable and remarkable for their Fidelity. How strange a Wickedness is it then to calumniate so highly and so publickly so many eminently deserving and Honourable Subjects of his Majesty! Now, the mischiefs naturally apt to flow from such a Calumny are these. It breeds ill Correspondence between our Fellow-Subjects and us, and makes us ill look't upon by them, which violates Civil Unity so necessary for the Peace and strength of a Kingdome; especially being between those two parties who have ever been so friendly and brotherly in their Affection and Allegiance to their Prince, and Fellow-Acters and Sufferers for his Cause; It discourages Loyalty to see that after such best Testimonies of it we are not even able to obtain a bare acknowledgment that we are Loyal, but that it shall still be lawful for any one at pleasure to brand us for Traytors, and this publickly in print in the face of all England? And lastly

ly (were not our known Fidelity too strong an Antidote for his malice) it tends to breed a conceit in our Governours that we are not to be endur'd in any State, and onely fit to be ruin'd and extirpated; not to mention the breach of Charity ensuing such unworthy Criminations, which must needs breed very many Feuds, and unneighbourlineſſ between private persons all over *England* and *Ireland*: Nor will there be ever any hearty Union in Church or State, till that wicked Uncharitableness of affixing upon a whole party the faults of some few be totally laid aside.

24. Now on what does my Ld ground these horrid Charges against our Church, or how proceeds he to make them good? After the old fashion, of quoting the private Opinions of a few Authors, viz. *Emonerius*, Father *Barnes*, *Emmanuel Sà*, *Tolet*, *Vasquez*, *Navar*, &c. Now my Ld supposes his Readers are to be credulous silly Asses, and to believe that these private Casuists or Discourſers are the *mouth of our Church*; that she by them *declares* what we are to *believe*; that such private Discourses are so many *definitions* of our Churches Doctrin or Faith: That these Discourses are held by our Church to be *Constant* and *Certain* (for *such* all Catholicks hold *her Doctrin* or *Faith* to be) whereas every Child knows these and such like Opinions are contrrollable & *changeable* as the Moon; that they were taught by Christ and his Apostles, whereas any one may and himself does quote who

first

first invented them : that they who deny or impugn them are *Hereticks*, whereas yet others *do* and any one *may* write against them at pleasure. Lastly, that these Points are all *Divine Revelations*, whereas the very nature of the thing shows and himself confesses they are all *Human deductions*. These Madnesses which are my L^d's First Principles in this whole Chapter and the Chapter foregoing, that is, in better half his book, if his Reader will be such a Bedlam as to yield to, then all his discourse is as sure as Gospel ; but if not, then 'tis Evident such Pretences are flat and most unconscionable Calumnies against our Church.

Little better is his quoting two or three particular Acts of some Popes: does he think the words *Church* and *Pope* are Equivalent, or that the word *particular act* signifies *Doctrin* or *Faith* that he should think three or four Acts all in several kinds, that is, one in each kind, argue the *Churches Doctrin* or *Faith* in those points. This in case he deals truly with those Popes ; but I know he is apt to deform all he meets with, and I see he does that of Pope *Clement* p. 268. which makes me suspect the rest. That Pope extinguish't the *Templars* ; and confest that *de Jure* he could not do it, but that he did it *ex plenitudine potestatis*. Here my L^d so interprets *de Jure* that he makes the Pope disown *any Justice* in doing it, that is *own* an *Injustice* in doing it, for that's my L^d's Intention in wresting those words ; which being impossible to conceive the Pope should
pro-

profess of himself, 'tis clear he meant by *de Jure* the same we mean by the words [*by Law*] that is, that there was no *positive Law* of the Church empowering him to dissolve them, yet, the Exigency requiring it, his Office might give him a *natural right* to do it; by which if Governours might not act in great Emergencies, but must be ty'd to let all go wrong because it happens no provision is made against it in any *written Law*; All Churches, Kingdomes, Cities, nay Families would be at the same loss the Spanish Master was at, who hiring a proud Servant and agreeing with him that he should do nothing but what was concluded between them and writ down, a while after falling in the dirt under his horse, and calling to his man to help him out, he told him he would first consult his written Paper whether that were put down there or no; where not finding it, he let his Master ly. But the case of Pope *Clement* is far from the Envy he would asperse it with: for why may not the Pope dissolve the Templars by his Power without Law, whereas Christian Princes and the Church universally complain'd of them, and mov'd him to it, and so their Consent went accompany'd with this action of their Chief Governour.

25. He hath onely two passages in that whole Chapter which even seem to concern our Church.
 One of the Council of *Trent* concerning a point of Practice put down by him thus, p. 266, 267.

That

That if a man have promist to a woman to marry her, and is betroth'd to her and hath sworn it, yet if he will before the Consummation enter into a Monastery, his Oath shall not bind him, his promise is null, but his second promise that shall stand, and he that denies this is accurst by the Council of Trent. Thus my L^d. ; where he tautologizes and layes it out at large to amplify it the more, adds the words *hath sworn it*, not found in the Council, but put in by himself because he was resolv'd we should be *Perjur'd*, and avoids, (as was his frequent custome) to put down the Councils own words in a distinct Letter ; so that his additions, may be safer and in more hope to escape too open shame. But to the point, I ask my L^d. as a Divine ; Does not he hold Heaven our last End, consequently that all our Actions are to be steps towards it, consequently that there can be no ty to embrace any state of life in case it appear upon mature consideration of circumstances highly unapt and dangerous to the attainment of Bliss ? I ask again ; would not my L^d. himself renounce actually living with a wife if he in his conscience judg'd so, but keep his promise let his Salvation go whether it would ? If he sees this plainly, then the difficulty consists not in breaking a promise made to a Temporal end, subordinate to our spiritual Last End for our Last Ends sake, but in this whether such a Case can be put. . . I propose him one ; may not a man come to see by better

know

knowledge of his Spoules humour, her newly-discover'd dishonesty, the Inconveniences he shall incur by her ill-condition'd Friends, and many such like, that such a Cohabitation tends to make his whole Life a hell upon Earth; which case is very possible and sometimes happens, to the eternal and temporal ruin of both parties, and the Infinit Scandal to the World? In this case does he not think in his conscience it had been better in all respects they had been parted ere Matrimony had been consummated? If then the man or woman to redeem their rashness in so lightly promising chose to debar themselves from all future hopes of marriage, and quite forsake the world to serve God in a Religious Life, it at once clears the reality of the Inconvenience, and the persons Intentions, and satisfies Temporal expectations, nay ennobles in the conceit of good Christians the Attempt by the knowledge, as far as any human Action can give of any Intention, that the person had no *base End* in his Action, but that which is *infinitely Best*. Oh, but this will *break all Contracts, Leagues, Vows, &c.* Let not my L^d. fear, there is too much Original sin in the world, for very many to run rather to a severe Life in a Monastery, and there to make vows of Chastity than to go to bed with their Brides. By this may be judg'd how my L^d. jumbles some *good Cases* with other *bad ones*, and makes all equally *naught*, did my designe of an Appendix give me leave to trace him through them all.

26. His next passage seeming to touch our Church is alledg'd, p. 265. *Thus it is affirm'd and was practis'd by a whole Council of Bishops at Constance, that Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks, &c.* This is something now, being the *Affirmation* (I suppose he means or would be thought to mean *definition*) and *Practice* of an approv'd General Council. Attend now, Reader, for here the Dissuader once or twice at least in a whole Chapter aymes to speak to the purpose.

But first, what a favour is this of my L^{ds}. not to put down the *words* of the Council where it *affirms* this? For this had made the case *plain* and the fault unavoidable. Next, (which is yet a greater kindness) he not so much as cites the *place* in which this Affirmation is found; and to disabuse the Reader, I assure him faithfully there is no such place or words found in the Council. To say that Safe Conduct given by Lay men absolv'd from the Secular Court but not from the Ecclesiastical, is quite another thing from his Invidious Proposition, and withal very Rational; For why should it, since both their Causes and Laws are distinct? Whereas to violate Faith given, and upon this score because the party to whom I gave it is an Heretick, which my L^d. falsely charges, is most unmanly, nay Diabolical. Yet, though it lay in the Churches power to proceed Juridically her way, yet it lay in the Emperours to hinder or differ the Execution if any publick Concern made it prudent. But what I

stand upon (with leave of others) is that *no safe Conduct was promist them to return*, but onely to appear and have a fair trial. My reason is, because in the *safe Conduct* given by the Council to *Hierom*, (and we may with reason conceive it was equivalently given to both) we find it given with this conditional clause, *Justice being still preserv'd*; Also, *Appear according to the tenor of thy foresaid writing to answer to those things which one or more will object to thee in the cause of Faith, that thou mayst receive and perform in all things the accomplishment of Justice*. Which implies that he was to expect Justice from the Council if he clear'd not himself. Again, a disciple of *Hussé's* who writ his tryal and death, and professes himself as much vers'd in the particulars as his senses could make him, complains indeed of safe conduct given by *Sigismund* in Writing of coming and returning; yet, putting down the very form of Safe Conduct, no such thing as *returning* is found in it. Nor did *Hus* in all his defence complain of *safe Conduct violated*, except when he was first bound, which was upon occasion of his flying and being brought back. Nay, the Emperour alwayes threatned *Hus* that he had rather burn an obstinate Heretick than defend him. In a word, all this clamour is built on the Testimony of the Hussites, and an imperfect relation writ in *Dutch* by an unlearned Catholick, which was greedily catcht at by such as leapt for joy to find any
licks

thing to bespatter the Church with, and startling some unattentive and too credulous Catholics, drive them, zealous of defending the Council, to an unwarrantable position; which Tenet and its practice my L^d. himself knows well the Generality of Catholics hate and detest as much as himself.

Eighth Way.

27. **T**He eighth and last Way is to pick out as well as I can those Propositions or Principles my L^d relies on, and show their Weakness; which is sufficiently perform'd by singling them out, and then naming them PRINCIPLES, they are so quite unlike what they're call'd. Now his *Principles* he layes in his first Section: I mean, his main and Fundamental Propositions, which because he relies on, yet never proves, we are from his carriage to take for *Principles* and Self-evident to him, though he himself calls them not so; for 'tis dangerous to them who have not Truth on their side even to mention the word *Principle*, *Evidence* or *Demonstration*.

His First concerning Scripture I shall speak to anon.

A second seems to be this p. 6. *We all acknowledge that the whole Church of God kept the Faith entire and transmitted faithfully to the After-ages the whole Faith; that is, to the Ages next after the Apostles*, as he expresses a little before, call'd by him p. 7. *the first and best Antiquity*,

and signify'd to mean *the First three Ages*. Now the Positive part of this Principle is good and Assertive of Tradition, but withall unapt to stand him. The Negative part of it, or that the third Age transmitted it not to the fourth, and so forwards, imply'd in his Discourse, would onely stand him; but 'tis left unprov'd, and so is a Voluntary Assertion, and strangely ridiculous. For, if the first two Ages kept the Faith entire and transmitted it to the third, 'tis Evident the Third was able to transmit it to the fourth, and so forwards; wherefore, it being Evident from the Concern of the Thing it was also *willing* to do so, 'tis demonstrable it *did* so. This Principle then on which he so much builds is either not for him, or else highly against him.

28. Another main and Fundamental Proposition (or Principle) is found p. 7. and as the former concern'd the Tradition of the Church, so this and the three following ones concern the Authorities of Fathers. *The present Roman Doctrins* (saith he) *which are in difference were Invisible and unheard of in the first and best Antiquity.* That is, no Heretick had arisen in those dayes (or in the first three hundred years) denying those points, and so the Fathers set not themselves to write Expressly for them, but occasionally onely; and yet, by his leave, our Controversits are frequent in citing them for diverse points, especially for the Ground of our Faith, the Churches voice or Tradition, to the utter overthrow

throw of the Protestant Cause. So far this improov'd and main position, disannulling all use of the Fathers of the first 300 years in our Controversies, is from not needing proof or being *Self evident*.

29. It may be his respect and value for the Fathers of the next Ages will make amends for this rashness. He tells us immediately after, that in the *Succeeding Ages, secular Interest did more prevail, and the Writings of the Fathers were vast and voluminous, full of Controversy and ambiguous Sences fitted to their own times and questions, full of proper Opinions, and such variety of sayings, that both sides eternally and Inconfutably shall bring sayings for themselves respectively*. Now, if they be so qualify'd that both sides may eternally dispute out of them, and neither be ever able to confute the other or conclude, then let him speak out and say all the Fathers after the first 300 years are not worth a straw in order to decision or Controversy; nor yet the Fathers of the first 300 years because they spoke not of our points *in difference*; and so there is a fair end of all the Fathers and of his own Dissuasive too for that part which relies on them, which looks like the most authoritative piece of it. The Reader will easily judge now whether we (as he charges us, p. 18.) *have many gripes of Conscience concerning the Fathers that they are not right on our side, or the Dissuader*. Our constant and avow'd Doctrin is (that the Testimony of Fa-

thers speaking of them properly as such, is *Infal-
lible*; that in two Cases they speak as Fa-
thers; that is, when they declare it the doctrine
of the present Church of their time, or when
they write against any man as an Heretick or
his Tenet as Heresy. Some complexions of Cir-
cumstances also may be found out by much
reading and comparing several considerations
which make it Evident they speak as *Witnesses*;
though it be more laborious and tedious to com-
pass a Satisfaction this way. Whereas (as ap-
pears by our Dissuader) the Protestants neither
acknowledge them *Infalible*, nor indeed *Use-
ful*. And this is my L^ds FOURTH PRINCIPLE,
which with the former destroyes the Efficaciouf-
ness of all the Fathers, & invalidates all that part
of his own Book which should seem weightiest.

30. Notwithstanding the two former Principles
to invalidate the Fathers, it may still be said by
the Catholicks in behalf of their validity (as was
by me now) that the Sayings of Fathers as *Wit-
nesses* are *Convictive*; and therefore it should
seem fit my L^d did lay another Principle to pro-
vide against that. He is not unmindful of it, but
hath taken order about it. For, though p. 9. he
tells us *the Fathers are good Testimony of the Do-
ctrine deliver'd from their Forefathers down to
them of what the Church esteem'd the way of Salva-
tion*; yet that is to be understood according to
the Rule premised p. 8. thus. *Things being thus
it will be Impossible for them* (the Catholicks)

to conclude from the sayings of a number of Fathers that the Doctrin they would prove thence was the Catholick doctrin of the Church, because any number that is less than all does not prove a Catholick Consent. So that unless each single Father affirm each single point to be of Faith or the Doctrin of the Catholick Church (which, morally speaking, is Impossible to happen) it follows by his words that 'tis Impossible to conclude thence the Catholick Doctrin of the Church; which amounts to this, that 'tis Impossible to conclude any thing in Controversy from the Fathers even taken as Witnesses. And this is his FIFTH PRINCIPLE.

A strange conceit, that it should be Impossible to know the Consent of all England in a matter of Fact, (for example, the late war) without speaking with each single man in the whole Nation. Yet this is his Discourse when he says, that no number less than all can prove a Catholick Consent.

31. Yet some use certainly he allows of the Fathers for all this, else why does he quote them. Yes, and the Principle (which I reckon his SIXTH,) by virtue of which he enforces them is this, p. 8. *The clear saying of one or two of those Fathers truly alledg'd by us to the Contrary will certainly prove that what many of them (suppose it) do affirm, and which but two or three as good Catholicks do deny, was not then a matter of Faith or a Doctrin of the Church.* I wish my La. had been so Ingenuous as to have made use of this

this Principle when he charg'd our *Church it self* with the mistakes of a few Writers contradicted, not by *one or two*, but sometimes by a whole Nation. But this Principle shows 'twas not *Reason* in him but *Will* and *Interest* which made him so hot. As for his Principle it self, it subsists not at all. For is it not known that more than *one or two*, that is S. Cyprian and the African Fathers deny'd the Baptism of Hereticks Valid, yet the Contrary was notwithstanding found and defin'd to be Faith and the Sence of the Church. Let him consider how perfectly he engages himself in the very Sphere of Contingency and recedes from Universality, the Sphere of Certainty, when he comes to rely on *one or two*; unless he can show those *one or two* strangely supported and upheld by Universal Nature or concurring Circumstances. 'Tis possible even one or two Lawyers may hap to be ignorant of two or three Acts of Parliament. But, my Ld is still the best confuter of himself, as appears lately by this present Principle apply'd to his former carriage against our Church; To himself then let him answer. I conceive that if *one or two's* (not denying it to be of Faith or affirming expressly 'tis not-of-Faith, he engages not so far; but) bare denying a point, argues what many do affirm, to be not-of-Faith; à fortiori, one or two's affirming positively that to be of Faith and the Doctrine of the Catholick Church which many others barely deny, argues 'tis of Faith: 'Twas of Faith then

then what *Gennadius* cited by himself, p. 59. affirms, that *After Christs Ascension the Souls of all Saints go from the body to Christ*; This being so, let him reflect what himself asserts, p. 49. that *Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Victorinus Martyr, Prudentius, S. Chrysostom, Arethas, Euthimius*, and *S. Bernard* affirm none go to Heaven till the last day. Either then *Gennadius* his Testimony *delivering the doctrine of the Catholic Church* is Inefficacious, and yet 'tis incomparably the best, nay the onely Efficacious one in my Lds. whole book, or else according to him many Fathers (and not *one or two onely*) denying a point is no argument but that point may be of Faith. Whether all those Fathers held so or no is another Question and requires a longer discussion.

32. Fathers then are useless to the Dissuader, as having according to him no *virtue* at all of settling the Understanding; Yet he must make a *show* of them, else all's lost; and so he tells his Readers, p. 8. as if all were well, two things, both very remarkable. The one, that, notwithstanding, *In the prime and purest Antiquity the Protestants are indubitably more than Conquerours* in the Fathers. A high Expression! but, compar'd with what he sayes, p. 7. that in those times our present *differences were unheard-of*, it signifies that they miraculously *more then conquer*, where (if his words be true) no mortals else could either conquer or even *at-*
tacque

ique. For how should one fight against such points in difference from those Fathers who *never heard* of those points! The other is, that *even in the Fathers of the succeeding Ages* the Protestants *have the advantage both numero, pondere & mensura*, in number weight and measure; which, joyn'd to his words at the bottome of p. 7. that *each side may eternally and inconfutably bring sayings for themselves out of those Fathers*, which signifies that 'tis to no end or purpose to alledge them, amounts very fairly to this, that he brags Protestants have a far greater *number* of Citations which are *to no purpose* than Catholicks have; that those Citations which have no possible force of concluding or *no weight at all*, do weigh more strongly for *them* than for *us*; and, lastly, that they have a greater *measure* than we of proofs not worth a rush with which they can bubble up their books to a voluminous bigness. And we willingly yield them the honour of having a very great advantage in all three, in case they be such as his own words qualifie them, to wit that each side may *Eternally and Inconfutably* alledge them.

33. We come now to his *main* and most Fundamental and (in comparison) his *onely* Principle, p. 9. laid out thus. *We do wholly rely upon Scriptures as the Foundation and final resort of all our Persuasions, but we also admit the Fathers, &c.* To finish our Discourse about the Fathers will make way to the Scripture. What means

admit-

admitting as contradistinguisht to *relying on*? Not, *relying on*; that's certain, for 'tis contradistinguisht to it; And yet to alledge any thing for a *Proof* as they do Fathers, and not to rely on it, is to confess plainly (for Truth will out) that they alledge them meerly for a *show*. He sayes they admit them as *admirable Helps for the Understanding the Scriptures and good Testimony of the Doctrin deliver'd from their Forefathers*. Have a care my L^d.: This supposes the Certainty of *Tradition*; For, if there be no Certainty of *delivery*, there is no *doctrin delivered*, nor consequently any thing for them to *testify*; and so the words *good Testimony* (unless our Ground of *Continual Tradition* stands) mean directly that they are *good for nothing*, as your former Discourses or Principles made them. But I ask, is their Interpretation of Scripture or Testimony *Certain*? If not, why should they even be *admitted*? Or how can *Uncertain* Interpreters and *Witnessers* be *admirable Helps* to interpret right and *good Testimony*? I fear my L^d. can onely mean they are *Admirable Helps* as Dictionaries and Books of Criticisms are to assist his Human Skill about the *outward Letter*. (which is a rare Office for a Father) and not to give him the *inward Sence* of it or the deliver'd Doctrin of the Catholick Church; for, unless *All* conspire to speak to the same point, if any one be silent concerning it, it argues not (according to my L^d. p. 8.) a *Catholick Consent*; and so is
far

far beneath an *admirable help*. And this is what we reprehend exceedingly in the Protestants, that they love to talk gaily in common of any Sacred or Grave Authority for an affected *form* or show; but not at all value the *Virtue* or *Power* of such an Authority, nor judge interiorly they have any worth valuing. They would credit themselves by pretending *Fathers*, yet at the same time lay wayes to elude them at pleasure; or (which is their very temper, springing from their renouncing Living and determinate Sence, and adhering to dead unsenc't words) they study to speak Indeterminately and confusedly, not particularly and closely.

34. Do I wrong them? Let my Ld. clear me; His First Principle is by him exprest to be the *Scripture*: and, on this Expression he so strongly builds that p. 10, 11. he concludes thence, and *Certainly* too, thus. *The Religion of our Church* (sayes he) *is therefore certainly Primitive and Apostolick, because it teaches us to believe the whole Scriptures of the old and New Testament, and nothing else as matter of Faith.* What mean the word *Scriptures*? Any *determinate sence* of it, or the *dead Characters*? Alas, their Church is far from teaching them the *first*, or from having grounds to own such a pretence; but puts the Book in their hands and bids them find the *sence* of it or their *Faith*, for there is their *Rule*. 'Tis the bare *Letter* then unsenc't he means by the word *Scriptures*; and so he must say 'tis the out-

ward Characters his Church teaches us to believe, and nothing else as matter of Faith; that is, their whole Faith has for its object, *Ink thus figur'd in a Book*; A worthy Argument to ptoove their Church is certainly Primitive and Apostolick: whereas 'tis known, Faith was *before* those Characters; and besides, if this be to be *Apostolical*, we owe nothing to the other Apostles for our faith, but onely to those six who writ. But we mistake him, he means *neither sence* of the word *Scripture*, and hates these distinctions with all his heart which would oblige him to either. He meant to talk of *Scripture* indeterminately and confusedly, which might make a *fine show*, and yet expose him to no Inconvenience by giving any particular account of his meaning. His Inference from this his First Principle, being an Immediate one, will utterly overthrow the Papists without doubt; *Therefore* (saith he p. 11.) *unless there can be New Scriptures we can have no New matter of Belief, no new Articles of Faith*. No my Ld: Yes, as long as by *Scriptures* you mean *no determinate sence* of Scriptures, but the *bare Letter* onely, whose sence is fetch't out by *Interpretations*, and these (as we experience) depend on men's private Judgments and *Fancies*; if men's *Fancies* may vary *every hour*, you may have diverse Interpretations *every hour*, and so *new Articles of Faith* every hour. Is not this a mad kind of arguing, to conclude as absolute an unerrable-ness in Faith, as if they had not onely a determinate

nate Principle but even as self-evident and unmistakable as the First Principle in Metaphysics to guid themselves by, whereas our daily eyesight and their own sad experience every day teaches us by the practice of this Principle, and yet their differing in the Sence of Scripture in most high and most concerning Points, that the Speculation is naught, and the Principle it self a false and mis-guiding Light. Nay I doubt my Ld. himself has no hearty value for this his First Principle, though he sayes he wholly relies on it; For I never saw Protestant Book in my Life thinner and sleighter in Scripture-Citations than is his Dissuasive: so that if that be his First Principle he makes little use of it.

35. Many other Propositions or Supposals are imply'd in his book to give it force. As that It matters not how a Citation is qualify'd so it be but alledg'd. 'Tis no matter whether the question be rightly stated or no. The Tenets of our Church are not to be taken from the use of definitions found in approved Councils, speaking abstractedly, but from the particular Explications of some Divines. Every Foppery is a proper Effect of the Churches Doctrin. Points of Faith ought to be comprehensible to Reason, and Spiritual things sutable to Fancy. The Act of an Inquisition, Sayings of a few Divines or Casuists are all Catholik Faith and the Doctrin of the Church. That is *rationally dissuasive* which is *confessedly Uncertain*. No Answer was ever
given

given to the Citations or Reasons produc't in the Dissuasive. Talking soberly and piously about a point is oftentimes as good as proving it. That tis Self-evident Scripture's Letter can bear but one Interpretation as wrought upon by Human Skills. These and multitudes of such like, though not exprest yet run imply'd in his carriage all along this book, and suppos'd true to give it any force; yet so evidently false and weak, that to pull them out thence and make them show their heads, is enough to confute them.

I conclude, and charge the Dissuader that he not onely hath never a Principle for his Dissuasive to subsist by, but farther, that 'tis Impossible but himself should know in his own Conscience that he has none, nay more that the Protestant Cause (and the same I say of all out of the Church) can have none. The first part of my charge I have manifoldly proov'd in this present Appendix; The other part of it which charges him with Consciousness of having no Grounds, hath two branches; and, for the former of those I alledge that the wayes he takes all along to manage his Dissuasive, are so evidently studious, so industrious, so design'd and perfectly artificial, that, though one who is guided on in a natural way is oftentimes not aware of his thoughts or their method till he comes to reflect, yet 'tis Impossible he should not be aware of his, which he postures with such exquisit craft and such multitudes of preternatural sleights to render his Discourse plausible, For the later of those Branches,

Y

namely.

namely, that he cannot but know the Protestant Cause can have no Principles, to make it Evident I discourse thus ad hominem, what I have provid in Sure-Footing out of the nature of the Thing. 'Tis their most constant and avow'd-Profession, and his p. 9. that they do wholly rely upon Scripture as the foundation and final resort of all their Persuasions. This being so, Fathers and Councils are not held at all by them, but as far as they are agreeable to Scriptures; that is, their Testimony has no basis of Certainty from themselves or of their own, but what they participate from Scripture. Wherefore either they are No Principles, or else Subordinate ones to their First Principle, Scripture. Unless then It be Certain or deserve the name of a Principle, They can never be held by Protestants such, nor consequently can merit the name of Principles (even Subordinate ones) because their pretended First Principle from which onely they can derive Title to that dignity is, in that case, none it self: To Scripture then lets come. By which word if they agreed to mean any determinate Sence of it certainly known to be the true one, their Discourse were well-built: But, since their Church can own no determinate Sence of the Scripture deriv'd down from Christ and his Apostles in antecedency to the Scripture's Letter, but (having renounc't that Way or Tradition) must say she has it meerly from that Letter as yet unsenc't, She must mean that 'tis the Scripture's Letter she relies on as the foundation and fi-

nal resort of all her Persuasions, nay even for her Persuasion that this is the Sence of it. Since then Principles are determinate Sences, not characters or Sounds, neither is Scripture (as they take the word) a Principle, nor consequently Fathers or Councils, whose Certainty is resolvable into It. They'l say, that Letter is a Certain Way to arrive at a determinate Sence, and consequently that they have determinate Sence by means of it. I ask, is the Letter alone such? Then, in case it alone be absolutely sufficient to such an Effect, it will perform it in every one; as, if Fire be alone sufficient to burn all the world, and so overpower all the resistance of the matter, do but apply it, 'twill do that effect or burn it. Is there requisit some Schollership in the Subject Scripture's Letter is to work upon, or desire to see Truth in their Will? Then, if this be the onely requisit, it will work its Certifying or determining Effect upon all Schollers and well-meaners; and so no Schollers and well meaners can disagree in the Sence of it. The contrary to which all sober men acknowledge, & daily Experience teaches us as much as we can be sure of any Human Action. The like Discourse holds whatever requisits they desire; for still it will follow they must say, that in whomsoever they place that requisit they cannot differ in the sence of Scripture, which Common Experience will confute. Nor will it avail them to run to Fundamentals, unless it be said the Trinity is no Fundamental, which the Dissuader makes the onely one p. 12. for the Socinians deny this, amongst whom

*'tis a strange Immodesty in the Protestants to say there is none well-meaning, Learned or unap-
ply'd to Scripture. Adding then to this most Evi-
dent Proposition that a Cause proper to produce
such an Effect if we put the Patient dispos'd and
the Application, alwayes produces its Effect,
on the Truth of which all Nature depends, adding
this, I say, to the obvious and common Experience
of Differers about Scriptures sence, in all whom
'tis Impossible to judge either Disposition of the
Patient, or Application is wanting, for all read
it and strive with all the wit and skill they have
to find the sence of it; it will follow most Evi-
dently that the Fault is in the Agent or Cause,
that is, that Scriptures Letter is unfit to Certify
or bring us to a determinate sence of it: and
therefore, since, till we know the Sence of that Let-
ter 'tis to us but meer Words, I am forc't by my
reason to judge they have no Principles (Those be-
ing Sence) but that their whole way is wordish;
and, not out of disrespect to them (for this touches
not them more than it does all others who have
left off the way of conveying down determinate
sence by Living voice and Practise, or Tradition)
but I am oblig'd by Conscience and my duty to my
Cause to declare that their whole Ground of their
Faith is thus hollow and empty. Whence I con-
test out of the nature of the thing, that their
Cause can bear no way of Sence or Principles,
but must forcibly be upheld by Wordishness; as by
quoting Texts without any Certain Interpreter,
Citations*

Citations of Fathers not brought to Grounds not held by themselves Certain, fine Scripture-phras'd flourishes of piety, and such like, In which the Dissuader is Excellent; Or else (if the Objecter be very witty and have taken a great deal of pains in the way of Scepticism to be too hard for himself) by bringing all into Uncertainty, which is the acutest way of Wardshipness, and most proper to oppose any Discourse that tends to Establish and Settle, because most opposit to it; and so I am to expect Necessity will force them to take this way when any replies to SURE-FOOTING.

I know some will expect I should have answer'd the Dissuasive particularly; but I know no reason why I should be solicitous to stand cutting of each single Branch of Errour or be careful to hinder their growth, after I have once pluck't the Tree that bore them up by the Roots.

P O S T S C R I P T.

IF my Ld. please to reply, (which I fear will be too troublesome a task, because of the ill-naturedness and Inflexibleness of Principles) or, if he resolve to write hereafter against our Church, his LP. is intreated he would please to go to work like a *Man*; that is, *orderly*, not *confounding* and jumbling all together. Let him first define then what makes a Thing obligatory to be held by Catholiks, a *Doctrin of our Church* or point of Faith; then put down the *very words* of the Council in case it be *defin'd*; next, acquaint us with the *nature* of his objections, vouch them *Conclusive*, and let his Reader know in what their *virtue* or *force* of Concluding is plac'd, for this will strengthen them exceedingly; and then let him fall to work when he will. Above all I beg of him not to go about to forestall the sincere verdict of Reason by corrupting first the Will of weak people by pious Talk; but first speak smart and home to their understandings with solid Reasons, and then at the end of the Book preach as much as he pleases against the *wickedness* of a Point when he hath once demonstrated its *Falshood*. Otherwise the *Sermon* so expands and ratifies the *Proof*, and his Godly Rhetorick so evaporates his Reasons, that it reflects no light at all; and so no mortal eye, though straining its optick nerves, is able to discern it.

A Letter

To Dr. Casaubon.

Honoured Sir,

AFTER I had printed *Sure-Footing*, I heard accidentally that you had been pleas'd to take notice of my *Way* and some signal Passages in *Schisms Dispatcht*. I was glad to hear that so ancient a Friend of mine had offer'd me a fair occasion to renew our acquaintance, resolving to take an account of his Exceptions, and requite them with a due Satisfaction as soon as I could find a season proper. Wherefore, when the last sheet of my Appendix against the Dissuader was under the press, finding both leisure and Opportunity to second my Intentions, I took your Book, perus'd diverse chief passages in it, and particularly what concern'd my self, p. 87.

The first glance of it put me in some Wonderment at the difference I found between you in your Book and the character of you in my Thoughts long ago imprinted there: For in these I found you a solid sober man, a good Scholar, as also ingenuous and candid; but in your Book, particularly in those passages, I saw plainly (and was troubled to see it) you had either none of those Qualities I imagin'd in you, or to a very *small* degree. But, I began straight to reflect with my self that as, when I was a child,

I fancy'd rooms very spacious and streets very long. which, coming to the state of a Man, I found very strangely diminish'd; so my ripen and more Judicious Thoughts saw now the measure of your virtues in their true demensions, which my younger and unexperienc'd years had so strangely magnify'd and enhanc'd. I doubt not but your outward appearance will make it thought by those that know you, I have said too much, let's see how I can justify myself.

I complain then that your carriage in this one page discovers you at once an absolute stranger to Science, and withal very uncivilly Injurious to me all along without any imaginable need, Ground or the least occasion given.

You begin with a mistake of the reason why the Rational Way explain'd in *Rusworth's Dialogues* was follow'd by me in *Schism Dispatch*, or rather why that way was *devis'd*; and conceive 'tis because we despair of maintaining the Popes Personal *Infallibility*, and think all your own if you disprove this; So that you strongly apprehend this the basis of all our Faith. By which I see Opinion and Faith is all one with you. Deceive not your self nor your Readers Sir; our Drs. came and do dispute against personal Infallibilities far more strongly than you are ever likely; and if you please to look into our Councils you find no news of building Faith on any such ground, but onely on Tradition. The Way I take is the old-and-ever-Way of the Church;
the

the farther *Explication* of it is indeed new, not occasion'd by our relinquishing Personal Infallibility of the Pope, (you shall never show the Church ever built her Faith on a disputable Ground) but by this occasion.

Had you look'd into Things and consider'd the progress of the Rational part of the world as well as you pore on Books, you would have discern'd that the Wits of this last half Century have been strangely curious and Inquisitive, and straining towards a Satisfaction apt to bring all into doubt which they conceiv'd to hinder their way to it. Had you reflected on those Heroes of such Attempts, the Noble and Learned *St. Kenelm Digby, des Cartes, Gassendus, Harvey,* and now *the Royal Society*, those living Libraries of Learning in their several wayes, you would have found that, parallel to them in the matter of *Controversy* were the *Ld. Falkland* and *Mr. Chillingworth*; whose acute wits finding no Establishment nor Satisfaction in the Resolution of our Faith as made by some particular Divines, nor yet in the Grounds of the Protestant Beleeft, endeavour'd to shake the whole Fabrick of our Faith, and allow but a handsome Probability to *their own*. Whence, Doubt and Inquisitiveness being the Parents of Satisfaction and Evidence, Catholick Controvertists began to apply themselves more closely and regardfully to look into the Grounds of their Faith, Tradition or Universal delivery; settled from the beginning of the Church,

Church, proceeded upon by Councils and all the Faithful, insisted on and stuck to by the Fathers, especially those who were most Controversial as *Athanasius*, *S. Augustin*, *Tertullian*, *S. Hierome*, &c. and at large by *Vincentius Lirinensis*; and, to consider how Proper Causes lay'd in Things by the Course of God's Providence had the virtue to produce the Effect of deriving down with Infallible Certainty Christ's doctrine to us. Hence sprung our farther Explication of this way which so much bewonders you. This is your mistake; now to your Injuries.

I quoted *Rushworth's Dialogues* and call'd it *The rich Store-house of motives fortifying Tradition*. Upon this your Reason works thus. *This I do not understand; I never heard of such an Authour; and it is possible the better to cry himself up he might borrow another name.* What means *This I do not understand*? I'll acquaint the Reader. It means you are so wedded to talk by the book that you are utterly at a loss if an Authour be quoted you have not heard of: The reason of which is because as I see by your Discourses, which look like so many dreams, your Genius inclines you not much to trade in Books which pretend to the way of Reason; and, if *Schism Dispatch't* so amaz'd you, 'tis to be fear'd that *Sure-Footing* and its *Corollaries* may put you out of your wits. But with what Civility should you hint I so extoll'd my self under another name, it being (as you say) but possible. Should I

I put upon you all things that were possible, what a Monster might I make you? But it abundantly manifests your short reach of reason that 'tis *highly Improbable*. For either I must have discover'd my self to the world to be Authour of both books and then I had sham'd my self with so high self-praises; or not have manifested it, and then where's the credit I had got by the other book I had so extoll'd.

Your next Injury is that *I make nothing of, and disclaim the Testimonies of Popes and Prelates, calling them the words of a few particular men, and cite for it Schism Dispatch't p. 98.* where there is not one word of either Pope or Prelate, nor of disclaiming any Testimony; nor of calling those *the bare words of a few particular men*; Now, if this be so, every word you charge against me is an injurious Calumny and your whole charge a direct Falsification. My words are these. *By this is shown in what we place the Infallibility of the CHURCH, not in the bare words of few particular men, but in the manifest and ample Attestation of such a Multitude, &c.* Where, though you cannot or will not, yet the Reader, if he understands plain *English*, will see I meddle not with who is or is not Infallible besides the Church, nor scan the validity of Testimonies of Popes or Prelates, but treat in what the Infallibility of the CHURCH consists: Now the word CHURCH denoting in its First Signification an *Universality*, I place her Infalli-

lity

lity in Universal Attestation from Age to Age. Notwithstanding which, my *Corollaries in Sure-Footing*, if your Wonderment at my *new Way* or your own habituation to words will let you understand them, will let you see I also place *Infalibility* in lesser Councils; & even in particular *Sees*; but most in the Popes or the *Roman*; not by way of an *Afflatus* (of which I for my part am able to give no account) but by a course of *Things Natural and Supernatural*, laid by Gods sweetly and strongly ordering *Providence* in *second Causes*. But what aggravates your *Falsification* is, that whereas I there counterpose *bare words* and *Attestation*, rejecting the first and making use of the later, you make me affirm *Testimonies* to be *bare words*; To which how much I attribute every such passage of mine will tell you; for on them the way I follow entirely builds. So that this whole Charge is either quite opposit or else disparate to what I say in the place whence you cite my words.

Your third Injury (and 'tis a strange one) is that I *sleight Scriptures, Fathers and Councils as much*, (in this business) and call them in scorn *Wordish Testimonies*; for which you cite *Schism Dispatch* p. 42. But not such a word is found there, nor I will undertake any where else in my Writings. 'Tis likely indeed, that speaking of such things as you use to call *Testimonies*, (for you name every sleight Citation *such* whether it have the nature of *Witnessing* in it, that is, be built

built on *Sensations* or no) I may say *they* are *wordish*, in regard you have no Certain means to arrive at their Sence; and till then I beseech you what are they else but meer *WORDS*? or rather meer *Characters* and *Sounds*?

What high deference I give to Scripture see p. 18, & 19: beginning p. 146. in *Sure-Footing*: To Councils, see Corol. 27. To Fathers, taking them properly, you may be inform'd by the whole Body of my Discourse concerning Tradition, of which they are a *part*, and the Eminentest Members of it in Proportion to their number.

Your 4th. Injury is that *the onely thing I place Infallibility in is Oral Tradition and the Testimonies of Fathers of Families*; whereas I place *Infalibilities* also in other things, though I make this the *greatest*. But your discourse makes me disesteem and exclude all others, both *Popes*, *Prelates*, *Fathers* and *Councils*, by establishing *this*; Whereas by settling *this*, I establish *all others*, nor find you any such Expressions in my Book; on the contrary 'tis evident by those words I *include* them; unless you think *Popes* and *Prelates* are not *Fathers of Families*, but take lodgings or hire rooms in other mens houses by the week. Truth is, being to express the obligatory descent of Faith from Age to Age, I cast about for a common word fit to express such Deliverers, and conceiv'd this of *Fathers of Families* the aptest; because the Church consisting of *Families*; this was most

Gene.

General ; and every Master of a Family, by being such, has an *Obligation* to see all under him taught their Catechism or Faith. This in common, which was enough for my purpose then. But, were I to distinguish the strength of those Testimonies, I should show that a *Priest* hath an Incomparable advantage above a *Layman*, a *Bishop* above *him*, and the *Head of the Church* above a *Bishop*.

Your 5th. Injury is lighter, because it speaks but your own Apprehensions and I am to expect no better from you. My many *chimerical suppositions*, and my *Impertinencies* in which I so please my self, must needs begets wonder (say you) in case the man (as probably) be of any account and reputation in the world. Now my *Suppositions* in the way I take are chiefly these, that men in all Ages had Eyes and Ears, the wit and (if they were good Christians) the Grace not to tell an open and damnable ly to no purpose ; and, for these, I should much wonder my self if you did not wonder at such odd Grounds, and esteem them *Chimerical*, because you have read them in no ancient book ; for you use not to look into *Things*. By this extravagant kind of dealing, you say you cannot but suspect me to be one of the Fraternity of the new-pretended Lights. I believe you heartily : For, to begin with Self-evident principles and thence to deduce Immediate Consequences is such a new Light to you, as I dare undertake scarce one beam of it

it ever enter'd into the Eye of your Understanding. I conceive 'tis the difference between your way & ours which breeds all this mis-intelligence. Ours ayms to bring all Citations to Grounds by way of Cause and Effect; yours to admit them confusedly, especially if writ by some old Authors provided they speak not for the Interest of Papists, for then they are questionable. Ours is to be backwards in assenting to any thing writ long ago, till our Reason be satisfy'd no Passion or mistake could invalidate its Authority; yours to believe them hand over head, if the book be but *said* to be Authentick; which is to a degree the same Weakness as that of the rude Country people who think all true they see *in Print*, and that their having a ballad of it is sufficient to authenticate it. Our Principle is that no *Authority deserves any Assent farther than Reason gives it to deserve*, and hence we lay Principles to assure us of *Knowledge* and *Veracity* in the Authour ere we yeeld over our *Assent* to his sayings. Yours is kinder-hearted than to hold them to such strict terms, and is well appay'd if some Authour you have a conceit of, praise the other for a *good Writer*, or his work for a *good Book*. Ours is to lay *Self-evident Principles* and deduce *immediate consequences*, and by this means to cultivate our *Reason*, that noblest Faculty in us which constitutes us *Men*; yours to lay up multitudes of Notes glean'd from several Authours; and, if you better any Spiritual Faculty you have,

have, 'tis your *Memory* not your *Reason*. Hence we carry, for the main of our Doctrin, and as far as 'tis antecedent to written Authority, our Library in our *Heads*; and can as well study in a Garden, as sitting in a Library stufft with books; whereas your way of Learning ties you to turn over leaves of Authours, as children do their Dictionaries, for every step of your discourse: and as an ingenious man said of those Poets who spun not their Poems out of their own Invention, but made them up of scraps of wit transferib'd from other Authours

-----Lord! how they'd look

If they should chance to lose their paper Book?

So we may say of you; that, if your Notes you have with much pains collected, hap to miscarry, you are utterly at a loss; so that little of your Learning is *Spiritual* and plac'd in your Soul, as true Learning should be, but in *material* and perishable paper and characters. In a word, your whole performance ends here, that you are able to declare *what other men say*; whereas ours aims at enabling us to manifest *what our selves KNOW*. No wonder then if our wayes being so different, we cannot hit it; but that, as you *think* ours *Chimerical*, so I assure my self yours, and consequently all you write in that way, is (as far as you go about to *conclude or cause Assent* by it) exceedingly *ridiculous*.

This, I doubt not, will confirm you in what you said before, that I am *no Friend to Ancient Books*

Books or Learning. To *Note-book* Learning indeed not much; to *true* Learning or *Knowledge*, very much; and even to *the other* as far as it conduces to *This*. To Books I am so much a Friend, that I desire not a few should be selected of each sort by a General Council of Schollers, and the rest burn'd, as did an ingenious person; but I would only have the riff-raff burn'd ('tis no great matter if that tedious Legend of Dr. Dees Sprights accompany them) and the Generality preserv'd; but so, that their Contents should be gather'd in Heads or Common-place books for Schollers to look in occasionally, not for *rational* Creatures to spend their whole lives in poring on them and noting them with a foolish expectation to find *true Knowledge* by stuffing their Heads with such a gallimawfry, and after 40. years thus spent, never the wiser; for, indeed, this is little better than for one to hope to frame himself a good sute of Apparel by picking thrums ends out of a multitude of old and overworn Garments. But to the point, I distinguish *Books*. And, as for the *Scriptures*, ascertaining their *Letter* and *Sence* (which is done by Tradition) 'tis clear they are of Incomparable value; not only for the Divine Doctrine contain'd in them, but also for many particular passages, whose Source or first Attestation not being universal, nor their nature much Practical, might possibly have been lost in their conveyance down by Tradition. Next, follows those of

Councils and Fathers, and (supposing Christ a perfect Law-giver) 'tis clear all they have to do with Faith is to *witness* the Churches beleef; and the former of them to *declare* or explain Faith or the *Churches Sence* against obstinate Hereticks. As *such* then their Books are to be valu'd, that is *exceedingly*. Next, follow such as *Euclid's* or *Archimedes* his, which express *Science*; and those are of very great worth, in regard they acquaint us with and manifest to our hands the *Knowledge* of the former world; which being *Speculative*, little of it could have come down by Tradition, except when that Speculation became Practical, and express'd it self in Matter by many useful or rather *needful* Arts, Trades or Manufactures. After these succeed *Opinionative Books*, of which this last Age has produc't multitudes; and these also are very useful, if the Reader go not too credulously to work, but have right Principles laid already in his head; for then the variety of mens Conceits and their Reasons for them will hint to a Considerer diverse Consequences, which otherwise the slowness and distractedness of our Reason would not have light of; nay, even the miscarriages of such Reasoners avail a wise man, as *Aristotle* out of the *contrary* Opinions of Philosophers, whom he saw failing in their Grounds, gathered very happily the *middle* Truth. These Books therefore are worth preserving. *Human Histories* come next; and These second Tradition in her object,

matter

matter of Fact, after she hath authenticated *them* and the *Circumstances* of their Writers. There are others fit for Explications or Rational Declarations of a point by Similitudes, allusions, Examples & such like, as *Pliny's Natural History*, Emblems, Fictions, & others of an *Ornamental Nature*; which being useful for Sermons and Discourses futable to the middle size of the world, 'tis plain they are preservable: With this caution that these and chiefly *Opinionative* books be either kept from the weak and credulous vulgar, or else in the Preface to them some learned Authority declare in common how far they are to be credited; lest by imposing on the reasons of the Generality, they hinder the world's improvement. *Prayer-books* and *Recreation-books* 'tis almost as Evident they are to be preserv'd, as 'tis that Prayers and Recreations are to be used. Onely caution is to be had the *former* be examin'd well and approv'd by Ecclesiastical Authority, and that the *later* be *chast* and *unabusive*. You have here my sentiment concerning Books; against which you shall find nothing in *Schism Dispatch't*, or any of my Writings. In a word, I would have every thing distinguish'd, examin'd by Grounds, & allow'd as far as 'tis reasonable: Nor wonder I much at your mistake of me in this point, for you are not the onely man that thinks all Books, and even Authority to be absolutely deny'd, when they are sort'd, and rank'd in their just degree of merit; that is, indeed, settled and e-

stablish't; for we *Metaphysicians* think nothing to stand firm but by *being*, or *being-held-to-be*, truly what it is.

You denounce *Woe to Colledges and Libraries* if these men should prevail. Yet, you see now I leave you *Libraries* enow, and permit you your onely darlings, *Books*; and onely desire you would love them *wisely*. Neither will *Colledges* forfeit their *Libraries* to my Discourse. Onely, whereas you would have *Schollers* educated there, onely pore on books, *Note* and (when they come to write,) *quote*, I would have them take *Principles* along with them by which to judge and consider of what they read. Without which 'tis to be fear'd their much reading will do them more harm then good; and even pervert honest *natural Reason* in them by filling their heads with a multitude of unconnected and unconnectible *Ends of Sayings*, impossible to be ever postur'd in the frame of *Reason*, and themselves unfurnish't of means to know which rather to adhere to; which may fit them to talk indeed of many things, like *Parrats*; yet, all the while, for want of *Principles*, know nothing of what they say. If you would have *Colledges* consist of such, I conceive I am a far better Friend to *Colledges* than your self are, and that no great cause of *Woe* will come to them by my means. But, as our way in your conceit brings *Woe* to *Colledges* and *Libraries*, so you affirm that *Atheism* and *Mahometism* will get by it. By which I understand

derstand what a Disputant you are. I beleeve you would quote Scriptures and Books to confute an *Atheist* or *Mahometan*; whereas I conceive, since all Discourse supposes an Agreement between the Discourfers in some Common Principle, and they denie or undervalue your *written* proofs, you must begin to confute them by Maxims of *common Reason*, antecedent to all Authority. For *these*, Human Nature obliges all men to hold to, unless they have quite irrationaliz'd themselves into perfect Scepticism; whereas they reject or sleight the *other*; which to render Efficacious you must go to work first with Principles of plain reason.

Your last Injury which I account the worst of all the rest, is deliver'd thus. *Others, of approved worth and abilities have met with this man, who, I think, have done him more credit than he deserved.* This argues you are so set to abuse me, that no Testimony, though never so valid, and confest to be such, can save you off. And the Judgment or Veracity of my Friends, who speak by Experience shall be question'd, rather than you will be brought to entertain any conceit of me that's handsome. You leap voluntarily into Falsifications and ill-languag'd misconceits without any motive, but are so restif and backward to think or speak in the least civilly of me, that witnesses of *approved worth and abilities*, cannot win you to favourable apprehensions nor keep you from pursuing your resolute

lute Cenforiousness. Had you found half that Testimony for the Authentickness of an old Writer in some mouse-eaten rag of Antiquity it had gone down currently with your Genius, and bin next to Gospel. I value not your Judgment of me; but highly and equally dislike your humour as void of all Ingenuity, whether it had been us'd to my self or another. When you review *Schism Dispatcht*, and see your mistakes, I hope you will have a good conceit of my Friends at least; for whom in this passage I apologize.

But that I may re-acquaint my self with you, I am to tell you that you also have met me formerly and knew me very well. Nay, that I am exceedingly bound to you for the best favour in the world; which is that, accidentally, you contributed to make me a Catholick. But, because 'tis long ago, I am forc't to remind you of it by two Tokens. One is that in *Durham-house* where you at that time lodg'd when you came to *London*, and in your chamber there, upon occasion of reading a book writ by a certain Protestant Bishop against the *Real presence*, I observ'd, and acquainted you with my observation, that, to my Judgment, the Fathers spoke more favourably for the Papists tenet than the Protestants: Hereupon, you took me by the hand and told me *they were mad who read the Ancient Fathers and saw not they meant Christ was as really in the Sacrament as in Heaven*. The other was yet more

more remarkable, and this; that (either your Grandfather or Father, I know not which, but I think) your Grandfather was intimate with Mr. *Calvin*, and, when he had put out his Explication of Christ's presence in the Sacrament, which dodg'd and shuffled between *really* and *not-really*, that is, between *is* and *is-not*, he challeng'd Mr. *Calvin* with it, and laid open to him the non-Sence and indefensibleness of it, asking him why he put out so strange an Opinion, which he was never able to make good? at which Mr. *Calvin* took hold of his own finger, and said, *See you this? I would willingly cut it off on condition I had never put it out so.* To which your Grandfather reply'd, *You should then explain it some other way;* Mr. *Calvin* answer'd, *My Institutions are so spread all over France that 'tis now too late.* Thus you, letting me see by a Testimony very *immediate*, that the late Authour of this Teneer which now so reigns all over *England*, with't his finger cut off when he writ it. How you will reconcile this with the late new piece of the Rubrick in the Common-Prayer-book, absolutely renouncing all *real presence*, in which point the Church of *England* formerly exprest her self abstractedly, do you consider.

Sir, I beseech you let this be a fair warning to you how you deal disingenuously for the future; and pardon some of my expressions to my high provocation and exceeding great hast: I

am sure the worst of them is a Civility compar'd to the harsh carriage you have us'd towards your self in openly falsifying both my words and sense, and causlessly wresting to an ill construction every passage you touch't; yet not doing me the right to go about to answer any one in the least, that so I might see by your Reasons you had Grounds to think as you writ. Had you argu'd against me I know too well the right of a Writer, to take it ill if you laid open and nam'd my conceived Faults, though the *names* of them had been *harsh Words*; but not even to attempt to confute them, yet to flie into such Expressions, is the very definition of *railing*. I was extreme sorry to lay open the Fault of a Friend, though my own Concern made it Fitting, and your demerit *Just*, and do assure you that onely the Injury to my Cause, which went along in that action oblig'd me to this Vindication. Setting aside the duty I owe to *That*, I am still as ever.

Your true Friend and

humble Servant,



J. S.

(1)

A LETTER

from

The Authour of Sure-footing,
to his Answerer.

S I R,

I Am certainly inform'd there is an Answer to my Book intended, and a Person chosen out for that Employment; whose Name I am unconcern'd to know, it being only his Quality as a Writer I have to do with. I receive the Alarum with great chearfulness; knowing that, if my Adversary behaves himself well, it will exceedingly conduce to the clearing and settling the main point there controverted. But, because there is difference between being *call'd* an Answer and *being* an Answer, and that 'tis extremely opposit to my Genius, to be task't in laying open mens Faults even as Writers, (though it has been my unhappiness formerly to meet with Adversaries, whose way of ~~writing~~ ^{writing} made that carriage my only duty) wherefore to prevent, as much as I am able, all occasion of such unfavorable oppositions, and to make way to the clearing the point, that so our Discourse may redound to the profit and satisfaction of our Readers, I make bold to offer you these few Reflexions; which in effect contain no more but a Request you would speak to the *point*, and in such a *way* as is apt to bring the matter nearer a clearing. This if you please to do, you will

A

very

very much credit your self and your endeavours in the opinion of all ingenuous persons. If you refuse, and rather chuse to run into Rhetorical Excursions, and such Discourses as are apt to breed new Controversies not pertinent to the present one under hand, you will extreamly disparage both your self, your party and your Cause, and give me an exceeding advantage against them all ; I shall also have the Satisfaction to have manifested before-hand by means of this Letter, that I have contributed as much as in me liest to make you avoid those Faults, which I must then be forc't to lay open and severely press upon you, little to your Credit nor your Causes neither ; You being (as I am inform'd and Reason gives it) signally chosen out as held most able to maintain it.

2. That there may be no more distance between us than what our Cause enforces, I heartily assure you that though I highly dislike your Tenets negatively opposit to what we hold Faith, and the Way of Writing I foresee you must take (unless you resolve to love Candour better than your Cause) as being Inconclusive and so apt to continue not finish debates, yet I have not the least *pique* against yours or any mans Person. Nor have I any particular aversion against the Protestant party ; rather I look upon it with a better eye than on any other Company whatever which has broke Communion with the Catholick Church : It preserves still unrenounc't the form of *Episco-*

pacy, the Church-Government instituted by Christ; and many grave Solemnities and Ceremonies, which make our Union less difficult: Many of their soberest Writers acknowledge divers of the renounc't Tenets to be *Truths*: some of them also profess to hold *Tradition*, especially for Scripture's Letter; and even for those Points or Faith-Tenets in which they and we agree; that is, where their Interest is not touch't. I wish they would as heartily hold to it in all other Points which descended by it, and look into the Virtue it has of *ascertaining*, and declare in what that Virtue *consists*; I am confident, a little candour of confessing truly what they finde, joyn'd with an endeavour of looking into Things rather than Words, would easily make way to a fair Correspondence. I esteem, and even honour the Protestants from my heart for their firm Allegiance to his Sacred Majesty and his Royal Father; This uniting them already with all sober Catholics under that excellent notion of good Subjects, and in the same point of Faith, the Indispensableness of the duty of Allegiance we owe our Prince by Divine Law. Lastly I declare, that for this as well as for Charitable Considerations, I have a very particular zeal for their reconciliation to their Mother-Church; and that 'tis out of this love of Union I endeavour so earnestly to beat down the wordish and *dissatisfactory* way of Writing, and go about to *Evidence* the Ground of all our Faith; knowing, that, as wounds are

never connaturally and solidly cur'd, by uniting the distant sides at the surface, and leaving them disunit'd and unheal'd at the bottom, but the cure must begin there first; so, the onely Way to heal the Wounds of the Church, is to begin first to win some to acknowledge the most radical and bottom-Principle of all Faith, as controverted between us; without which all agreement in particular points must needs be unsound and hollow-hearted. This is my onely aym in *Sure-Footing*. That therefore you may not obstruct so good a work, and withall perform the duty of a solid and candid Writer, I offer to your self and all ingenuous Readers these few Reflexions: not sprung from ~~My~~ Will (for what Authority have I to prescribe you your method) but from true Reason working upon the Thing; which makes it just duty in you, and so ought oblige you to follow it.

3. In the first place, since the scope of my whole Book is about the *First Principle in Controversy*, or the Ground of all Faith, as to our Knowledge; that is, about a Point antecedent to all particular Points; I conceive it reasonable you should let your Discourse stand firm to the matter in hand, and not permit it to slide into Controversies about Particulars. For so, 'tis evident, we shall be apt to multiply many words little to our present purpose. On what conditions you may have right to alledge Particulars as pretended Instances of Traditions failing, shall be seen hereafter.

4. Next,

4. Next, I desire you would please to speak out Categorically, and declare whether you hold Faith *absolutely Certain to us*, or else *Possible to be false for any thing we know*. To explicate myself better, that so I may void some common and frivolous Distinctions, my intent is to demand of you in behalf of the Christian Reader and his due satisfaction, whether you hold Gods Providence has laid in the whole Creation any Certain means, by way of Proper Causes to such an Effect, to bring down Faith truly to us, and whether we can arrive at Certain Knowledge of those means, that is, come to *see* or *know* the Connexion between such Causes and their Effect spoken of. I make bold to press you earnestly to this declaration; and my reason is, because nothing will more conduce to the Conclusion of our present Debate: For, in case such Causes *be* laid and can be *seen* by us, then they are Evident or Demonstrative Reasons for the Ground of our Faith's Certainty: But, if no such Causes be *laid*, or being laid, cannot be *seen* by us, then all the Wit of man can *never* avoid the consequence, but that we can have only Probability for all our Faith; that is, for any thing we absolutely know, 'tis all as false as an old wife's tale; since there are no *degrees* in Truths and Falshoods. If you advance this Civil piece of Atheistry, you must pardon me if I be smart with you in opposition to so damnable and Fundamental an Error: I love Christianity and Mankind too

well to suffer that Position which destroyes effectually the Root of all their Eternal Happiness, and the Substance of all their Hope, to pass un-stigmatiz'd, as it deserves. Nor think to avail your self by some Discourfers in our Schools, It will be shown, when prest, that they are still preserv'd good Christians through the virtue of Tradition which they all hold to, notwithstanding their private speculations: but you not, because of your want of Certain Grounds, to make you rationally *hold* Christs Faith. They onely mistook a Word, whereas you will be found to erre in the whole *Thing*, or the ordinary Means to true Christianity.

Again, if such Causes be fitting to be laid by God's Providence, 'tis impossible to avoid the Doctrin propos'd in *Sure-Footing*, because 'tis absolutely Impossible to invent any thing that looks like such Causes, but those which are deliver'd there; nor did any other Way ever attempt to show any such. Whence I foresee your Cause will force you to fly for refuge to the actual Uncertainty, or possible Falshood of all our Faith for any thing any man living knows by ordinary means. A sad consequence of an erroneous tenet! But 'tis connatural, and, so to be expected, such Effects should follow the renouncing the Rule of Faith.

5. Thirdly, I conceive it very reasonable that you would please to declare whether *Controversy* ought to have any First Principle or no; If *none*, then

then to speak candidly out, and confess that *Controvertists* are *Certain* of *nothing* they say, since their discourse has no *Ground* or *First Principle* to rely on. If *any*, whether *Tradition* be It; or, if it be not, what else is; and then vouch (as plain reason tells us you ought) that what you assigne has truly in it the nature of a *First Principle*, which common Reason gives to be *self-evidence*. Or, lastly, to profess (if you judge it your best play) that, what you substitute instead of *Tradition*, though it be a *First Principle*, yet it need not be at all *self-evident*. Any thing shall content me, so you will but please to speak out, and to the point.

6. Again, since it is evidently your task to argue against *Tradition's Certainty*, 'tis as Evident that while you argue against it, you must bear your self as holding It *uncertain*; I conceive then plain Reason obliges you not to produce any thing *against* *Tradition* which depends *upon* *Tradition* for its *Certainty*; for, in doing so you would invalidate and even nullify all your own proofs: Since, if *Tradition* be held by you *uncertain*, and they have no certainty but by means of It, they must be confest *Uncertain* too; and so they would be incompetent to be produc't as *proofs*, and your self very *dis-ingenuous* to produce them: I add *self-contradicting* too, and *Unskilful*; Nature and *Aristotle* teaching us, that a Discourser ought not sustain contrary to himself. Hence plainest Reason excludes you

from alledging any kind of Testimony, either from Scripture, Councils, Fathers, or History, till you answer my Corollaries 12, 15, 16. which pretend to demonstrate the Certainty of all these dependent on Tradition's; and the onely way to show my discourses there to be weak, is to manifest my mistake by declaring into what other thing your Certainty of those Testimonies is finally resolvable, which is not coincident with Tradition. When you produce such a Principle, and prove it such, you have right to alledge the foresaid Testimonies, for then you can make good their Authority: Till then, you can have no right in true reason to do it. Not onely, because till then you are to be held a Renouncer of that Thing's Certainty upon which there are pretended demonstrations against you Theirs is built; and those presum'd true ones, because you let such strongest Attempts pass unanswer'd; but very particularly for this Consideration that our present matter restrains you from it: For, our discourse is about the Ground of that Authority which ascertains to us Faith; which therefore is antecedent to the notions of Faith, Faithful, Church, Councils, Fathers, nay and creditable History-books too; since those rely on Tradition (taken at large) for their Certainty, as is evident by plain reason, Coroll. 16, 24. which devolves into this, that Tradition is **FIRST AUTHORITY**, and so not provable or disprovable by any other secundary *Authorities*, but ought to be

be impugn'd by pure *Reason*. But, if you think fit to grant this Certainty to Tradition taken at large, yet deny it to *Christian Tradition*, which hath, besides its Human force most powerful Divine Motives also to strengthen it; please to speak it out, and the strange unreasonableness of the position will quickly be made appear. Or, if you grant *Christian Tradition* Certain in bringing down those common Points in which we agree, yet Fallible, nay actually erring, in bringing down to us those other points which we were found holding upon Tradition when you left us, and for which, as grievous Errors, you pretended to leave us; please to declare in what you hold the *virtue* of Tradition consists, *ascertaining* to us both those common points, and how we come to know Tradition is engag'd for them; which done, it will quickly appear whether its *ascertaining* virtue has its Effect upon *some*, and not others; or on *all*. Unless you do this, your very admittance of Tradition's Certainty in *some*, overthrows you without more ado: for, to acknowledge it argumentative for the Certainty of *some*, grants it a virtue of *Ascertaining*, which therefore you are oblig'd to grant in *all*, unless you give the reason of your Exception: otherwise to admit it when your Interest is not toucht, and reject it when it opposes you, is plainly to confess that Tradition is able to *certify*, yet that you admit it when you list, and reject it when you list.

7. Being inform'd then by Evident Reason,
that

that no kind of Authority but only the way of Reason is a competent Weapon to fight against Tradition with ; I have three things to propose to your Thoughts on this occasion, which I hope will sound reasonable to any intelligent man by the very mentioning. First, that you would not alledge such Arguments as strike as well at the Constancy of every *Species* in Nature, especially Rational Nature ; that is, such natural *Medi-ums* as tend to destroy all Natural Certainty. Secondly, that your objections be not forrain, or fetch't from afar of ; for these are multipliable without End, and apt to be suggested by Fancy upon every not-seeing the coherence of some other remote (whether real or conceited) Truth, with the Tenet we aim to impugn ; but that they be *immediate* and *close*, that is, taken out of the Intrinsic Nature of the Thing ; For so, they will be more forcible and by consequence be apt to do your Cause much service ; and unless they be such, they will do it none : For, in regard my whole process is grounded on the nature of the Thing, as appears by my Transition, and every Logician knows that *remote* and *common* considerations are liable, for any thing we know, to be connected or not-connected with the point we would apply them to, because we see no Connexion but what's Immediate ; it follows that 'tis a very incompetent and dissatisfactory way to impugn an Adversary who endeavours all along to frame his discourse out of the

the

the Intrinsic Nature of the Thing, by remote, or unimmediate, that is, indeed, *Unconnected Mediums*. The third thing I request is, that you either grant that no Argument or Reason is Conclusive, Obliging-to-Assent, or Satisfactory, but what is either Proper (at least Necessary) Cause or Effect; or else show us out of Logick that other *Mediums* have this virtue, and how they come to have it. This way of procedure will give me a great respect for you as taking honestly the Way which is apt to clear Truth; and you will have this Satisfaction to your Conscience that you have endeavour'd it to your power by following the best method you could imagin to give your Cause its due advantage, in case it can bear that Test; that is, in case it be Truth. And, if it cannot bear it, that is, if it be no Truth, 'tis your own best Advantage by this strict procedure to have discover'd it. Your Judicious Readers also that look seriously for satisfaction, will rest much edify'd and thankfull for your pursuing that Method which is likely to save them a great deal of fruitless pains in reading multitudes of books writ in a loose way, whence no Conclusion or Satisfaction is likely to result.

8. My fifth request, and I hope 'tis just and reasonable, is this; that, if you conceive your Discourse has made good the Certainty of Written Authorities or quoted Testimonies, *without* Tradition, (which I see is impossible,) and hence
you

you make account you have title to produce them against Tradition's Certainty, (That being the matter in hand) and therefore you resolve to pursue the way of Citing Authours; you would then be pleas'd to vouch your Citations to have truly in them the nature of Testimonies; that is, to be built on *Sensible* Knowledge, and not on *Speculative*, or Opinion in the Authour alledg'd, and that they fall under none of Dr. Pierce's faulty or Inconclusive Heads; or else shew they are Conclusive though thus Faulty, which is done by confuting my Grounds laid in my First Appendix. §. 6, 7, 8. Or, lastly, to declare, that though thus Faulty and Inconclusive they ought still to be alledg'd; and to give your reason for it; which, candidly spoken out; I am sure will be this, that you must either produce such, or none. I hope all our ingenuous Readers will think me very reasonable, who am well contented with any thing which is spoke out expressly and declaratively of what *method* or *way* of *Satisfying* you take; and onely desire you would not quote and speak *confusedly* and *in common*, as if you meant to persuade your Readers that your discourse has in it some strange force taken in the bulk, though you will vouch no one particular piece of it to be Certain; or, as if you suppos'd their reasons were to be amaz'd and stupify'd meerly at the venerable *Names* of Authors and the solemnity of a diverse-letter'd, or diverse-languag'd quotation, without

without clearing to their Judgements the *virtue* by which such Citations can pretend to have force able to subdue their understandings to Assent, or (which is all one) *satisfy* them. If you refuse to do me reason in this point, and still resolve to pursue the huddling together Testimonies without warranting their Certainty by showing upon rational grounds they must be such, I shall declare beforehand to my Readers, that I must be forc't to do right to my self; which is, to rank all your Testimonies under Dr. *Pierce's* Faulty Heads, and so let them go as they are.

9. Particularly, I beg the Justice of you not to think to over-bear me with the conceiv'd Authority of other Divines resolving Faith in their Speculative Thoughts after another manner than I do: since this can onely tend to stir up Invidiousness against my person (which yet their charity secures me from) and not any wayes to invalidate my discourse. For, every one knows tis no news Divines should differ in their way of explicating their Tenet, which they both notwithstanding hold never the less firmly; and every learned man understands that the word *Divine*, importing a man of *Skill* or *Knowledge* in such a matter, no Divine has any Authority but from the Goodness of the Proofs or Reasons he brings and on which he builds that Skill. Please then to bring, not the empty pretence of a Divines Authority or Name to oppose me with, and I shall freely give you leave to make use of the *Vir-*

one of their Authorities, that is their *Reasons* against me as much as you will. I easily yeeld to those great discourfers, whoever they be, a pre-
 cedency in other Speculations and Knowledges, to which they have been more addicted, and for which they have been better circumstanc't; In this one of the Ground of Faith, both my much
 Practice, my particular Application, my Discourses with our nations best Wits of all sorts, my perusing our late acute Adversaries and the Answers to them, with other Circumstances; and lastly, my serious and industrious studying the
 Point, join'd with the clearing Method God's Providence has led me to, have left me (as far as I know) in no disadvantage. What would
 avail you against me and our Church too (for my Interest as defending Tradition is indissolubly linkt with Hers) is, to show that our Church
 proceeds not on Tradition, or that in Her Definitions She professes to resolve Faith another way rather than mine, or (which is
 equivalent) to rely on something else more firmly and fundamentally than on Tradition. But
 the most expresse and manifold Profession of the Council of *Trent* to rely constantly on Tradition, has so put this beyond all possible Cavil on
 my side, that I neither fear your Skill can show my Grounds in the least subcontrary to hers, nor
 the Goodness of any Learned and considering Catholik (however some may conceive the Infallibility of the Church plac't *ad abundantiam*

in something else) will or can ever dislike it. I expect you may go about to disgrace my Way as *new*: But I must ask, whether you mean the *substance* of it is *new*, or onely that 'tis now *deeper* look't into and *farther* explicated than formerly: If you say the former, my *Consent of Authorities* (p. 126, 127, &c.) has clearly shown the contrary; and common sense tells us no other way was or could be possibly taken (for the Generality of the Church at least) in Primitive times till Scripture was publisht universally and collected: If the later, please to reflect, that every *farther* Explication or Declaration, as far as 'tis *farther*, must needs be *new*; and so, instead of disgracing us, you most highly commend our reasons for drawing consequences *farther* than others had done before us. Again, if it be onely a *farther* *Explication*, 'tis for that very reason *not-new*; since the Sence of the Explication is the same with the thing explicated; As 'tis onely an Explication, then 'tis *not-new*; as *farther*, 'tis indeed *new*, but withal innocent, nay commendable. But there are three things more to be said on occasion of this object-ing Catholik Divines; One is, that, taking Tradition for the living voice of the present Church as I constantly declare my self to do, not one Catholick does or can deny it; for he would *eo ipso* become no-Catholick but an Arch-heretick; and this all acknowledge. In the *thing explicated* then, that is, in the notion of Tradition all agree with me (and consequently in the *Substance* of
of

of my Explication) nor can any do otherwise, except they be equivocated in the Word *Tradition* and mistake my meaning, which I conceive none will do wilfully after they have read here my declaration of it so unmistakably laid down. The second thing is, that an Alledger of those Divines will onely quote their Words as Speculators, not those in which they deliver themselves naturally as Christians or Believers ; which Sayings were they collected, we should finde them unanimously sounding to my advantage, and not one of them oppositely. And, lastly, speaking of our Explication as to its *manner*, Divines contradict one another in other kinds of Explications, but not one Author can be alledged that expressly contradicts this which I follow.

10. My sixth request is, that you would speak to the main of my Book, and not catch at some odd words, on the by as it were : Otherwise, understanding Readers will see this is not to answer, but to cavil.

11. And, because we are (I hope) both of us endeavouring to clear Truth (I am sure we ought to be so) therefore, to acquit your self to your Readers that you ingenuously aim at it, I conceive you will do your self a great deal of right, and me but reason, nay (which is yet weightier) do the common Cause best service, if you will joyn with me to retrench our Controversie as much as we can. Let us then avoid all Rhetorical Digressions and Affectations of Witty and
fine

fine Language; which I have declin'd in my whole Book, and chosen a plain downright manner of Expression, as most suitable and connatural to express Truth. Likewise all Repetitions of what particulars others have said or answer'd before us, such as are the Objections made by that ingenious person, the *L. Falkland*, and the Answers given them in the *Apology for Tradition*; unless it be conceiv'd those Solutions are insufficient, and Reasons be offer'd why they are judg'd so. For I conceive it an endless folly to transcribe and reprint any thing others have done before us, except it be Grounds which ought to be oft inculcated and stuck to; and those particulars which we show to be not yet invalidated, but to preserve still their strength. Much less do I suspect it can fall under the thought of one who aims to discourse rationally (such my Answerer ought to be) to rake together all the filth and froth of the unwarrantable Actions or Opinions of some in the Church, or to run on endlessly with multitudes of invective & invidious sayings on his own head without proof; & then apply them to the Church, as does the *Disswader*. It would also very much conduce to the bringing our differences to a narrower compass if you would candidly take my Book endways, and declare what in it is evident, and so to be allowed; what not: What Principles are well laid or Consequences right drawn; and what are otherwise: To requite which favours, I promise the

same Carriage in my Reply to you. By this means it will be quickly discover'd whether or no you have overthrown my Discourse by showing it ill coherent, and how far 'tis faulty; that, if I cannot clear it to be connected, I may confess my fault and endeavour to amend it. For, however I see my Grounds Evident, yet I am far from judging my self Infallible in drawing my Consequences; though I see withal the method I take, will not let me err much; Or, if I do, my Errour will be easily discoverable; because I go not about to cloud my self in *words*, but to speak out as plain as I can from the nature of the *Thing*.

12. In the next place I earnestly request you, as you love Truth, not to shuffle of the giving me a full Answer, nor to desist from your Enterprize (as I hear a Certain person of great esteem for his learning and prudence has already done) though you find some difficulty where to fasten upon the Substantial part of my discourse. There are perhaps many difficult passages which my Shortness forc't me to leave Obscure; These will naturally occasion mistake, and Mistake will breed Objections to impugn me with. Please, if others fail, to make use of those at least. 'Tis no discredit in you to mistake what's obscure; rather it argues a fault in me (did not my circumstance of writing Grounds, & onely to Schollers, excuse me) that I left it so; To make amends for which I promise you to render it clear when

I see where it pinches you or others. And on this score, I owe very particular thanks to Mr *Stillfleet*, that by speaking clearly out his thoughts, he gave me a fair occasion to open that point he impugn'd, I think, upon mistake of our Tenet.

13. If you think fit sometimes to argue *ad hominem*, be sure what you build on be either our Churches Tenet or mine; for I am bound to defend nothing else. If then you quote Fathers, first, see they speak as Fathers, that is as Believers and Witnesses; for so 'tis evident our Church means them by her Expressions in the Council of *Trent*; as also did Antiquity. For both of them constantly alledge and stand upon *Traditio Patrum*, not *Opinio Patrum*: Next, see you bring *Consensus Patrum*, or an agreement at least of very many of them speaking as Witnesses, otherwise you will not touch me nor our Church; for she never abetted them further. In case you bring Councils, it would be very efficacious you would chuse such Testimonies (if you can finde them) as I brought from the Council of *Trent*; that is, such in which they declare themselves (or the Circumstances give it) they proceed upon their *Rule of Faith*: For, otherwise, every one knows that Bishops in a Council have in them, besides the Quality of *Faith-Definers*, those also of Governours, and of the most Eminent and solid *Divines* in God's Church. If Scripture, you must make Evident the Certainty of your way of arguing from it, ere I or our Church shall allow

it argumenative. Thus much for Authority. If you oppose me by my own Principles or Discourses of my Reason, I must defend my self as well as I can. One thing on this occasion, I must mind you of; 'tis this, that though you should conquer in this way of arguing *ad hominem*, you onely conquer *me* as a Discourser, by showing that I contradict my self; not my *Tenet*: for to prove that false, you must fix your foot and build your discourse on some Certain Ground; which barely my *holding* it (on which your discourse *ad hominem* relies) cannot make it. You must build then on some Grounded Truth if you will go about to overthrow a pretended one. Indeed, if you can show Tradition contradicts her self, you will do more than miracle, and so must conquer. But I fear not the Gates of Hell, much less Man's wit can prevail against that impregnable Rock. Onely, I beseech you bring not as Parallels against our Tradition in hand, which is a vast and strong stream, other little petty rivulets sprung originally from the Sensations of two or three: For, then, as one side was liable, in a thing not known publikly, to bely their Senses; so the conveyance down of such sleight built Attestations may easily be self-contradictory. In a word, if you will argue, take first into your Thoughts the nature of the Thing you argue against, and then fall to work as soon as you will. Now, if you should chance to say you hold the Sayings of Fathers and Councils (some at least, to be *Certain*,
my

my Reason tells me from Principles, that, having renounc't Tradition which onely could ascertain them, rational nature in you will not let you have any hearty conceit of their Convictiveness, whatever you pretend ; but that you rawly alledge them, and so let them go with a *valeant quantum valere possunt*. That therefore we may have some security more than your bare word (which Experience tells us is now affirmative now negative in this point, as it best suits your Interest, or, after a pretty Indifferent manner, half-one-half-tother) that your profession of holding to such Authorities is not hollow-hearted but rooted in your Reason, 'tis just your Readers should expect you would declare in what the virtue of *Certifying* consists, and that They have this virtue. This if you do, you acquit your self to go to work solidly, and you offer us fair play in giving us some hold of your Reason, whereas a common Expression gives none. This Procedure also will show, when apply'd, whether you are Justifiable or no for admitting some Authorities of that nature and rejecting others.

14. My last request is, that, if in the course of your Answer you think fit to complain of me for bringing History and other Proofs heretofore commonly without more ado admitted, into Incertainty : please to amend the fault you finde, and settle their Certainty on some better Principles than I have endeavour'd. In the mean time 'tis Evident my whole Book aims at settling the Certainty of
all

all Authority, by evidencing the Certainty of *First Authority*; upon which the Assuredness of History, Fathers, Councils, Church, Faith, nay Virtue or Christian Life must all be built. This is my way; if you judge it incompetent to do the Effect spoken of, be pleas'd to manifest it Unfit and show us a Better.

15. Perhaps I may have demanded more of you in some particulars than is due from the strict duty of meerly answering: in the Schools, a bare denial, or distinction is enough for a Respondent. But I conceive *we* are not on these terms: in regard we are not met face to face, where the returns of the one to the other can be quick on every occasion. This obliges us, for the Readers satisfaction, to enlarge our selves and bring reason for everything we affirm or deny, lest we should be thought to do it *gratis*. And, your case here, is particularly disadvantageous: For, if you go about to overthrow that on which I aym to show the Certainty of all Authority built, and yet *declare* not on what your self hold them built, and, by your faithful promise to show it shortly, give them strong hopes you will perform it; you send them away very much dissatisfy'd either with you or with all the Authority in the world, though built on Sensitive Knowledge: Of which it being impossible Rational Nature should permit them to doubt, they must needs dislike your attempt, and have an ill conceit of your performance.

SIR, I understand, to my exceeding Satisfaction, that multitudes of the most Eminent, Solid and Ingenuous Wits of our Nation have been diligent perusers of my Book. Consider, their eyes are upon you while you Answer; I am confident they will judge I have requested no more of you in this Letter, but what's reasonably due to their and my satisfaction; and so, will look your Answer should be correspondent. They are weary of endless Contests about Faith; and, seeing we are not now contraverting the signification of some ambiguous Testimony, but penetrating deep into the very bowels of a point which is of the greatest concern in the whole world; and pursuing (in a method likely to decide) the clearing of it, their expectations are very much erected and attentively observing what will be the issue of this rational combat. Frustrate not their desires to see Truth manifested by bringing the Question back from the plain open field of Evidence to our method, to a Logomachy or word-skirmish in a Wilderness of Talk, out of which the Thread of Grounds or Principles had disengaged it. To them therefore as well as your self I address this; requesting those of them who are acquainted with my Answerer, to press him to do himself, me, the world (his Cause too, if it can bear it) the right due in Reason, and here demanded. This Sir, if you will perform, I shall lay aside the remembrance of the Justice I have to it, and look upon it purely as a Favour and most obliging Civility to him who is, next to Truth's,

Feb. 6th
1665.

Your Friend and well-wisher,
J. S.

POSTSCRIPT.

IF you complain of this Fore-stalling as *Un-usual*; as long as 'tis *rational* you can have no reason to do so: and it will appear *such* to him that considers it was an *unusual* Circumstance occasion'd it. 'Tis this: I had endeavour'd to bring Controversie from an Endless to a Conclusive Way: and both my Reason and Experience made me apprehend my Protestant Answerer would have such strong Inclinations to bring it back into the way of quoting and glossing Testimonies (that is, into a wordish scanning a great part of all the Libraries in the World) that a slender touch at it in my Book was not forcible and express enough to oblige him to take notice of it. Having communicated therefore my thoughts with intelligent and ingenuous persons, both Catholiks and Protestants, and receiv'd their approbation, I resolv'd, and pursu'd it as you see; And I hope the manifold Usefulness of it (as shall be seen what way soever now you take upon you of answering) will sufficiently justify my Action.



FINIS.

n-
no
im
ce
to
u-
ce
rer
it
ti-
eat
a
ble
ce
ny
ns,
eir
e;
as
on
ny